Catholicism and Humanity

BY THE REV.

W. G. PECK

Author of 'The Values of the Sacrament,' 'The Divine Society,' etc.

I. Catholicism and Society.
II. Catholicism and the Soul.
III. Catholicism and the World's Future.

A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd.
London and Oxford

Class 280.31S P337 Book
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

Purchased from the fund bequeathed to the Seminary by
EUGENE AUGUSTUS HOFFMAN, D. D.
DEAN 1879-1902

10 NOV 1926

CATHOLICISM AND HUMANITY

CATHOLICISM AND HUMANITY

BY

THE REV. W. G. PECK

Author of

'The Values of the Sacrament,' 'The Divine Society,' etc.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY NEW YORK

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD.

LONDON: 28 Margaret Street, Oxford Circus, W.1

OXFORD: 9 High Street

MILWAUKEE, U.S.A.: The Morehouse Publishing Co.

Printed in England

280.315
P337
80480

First impression, 1926

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

TO

THE REV. C. E. OSBORNE, M.A.

RECTOR OF WALLSEND

AND HON. CANON OF NEWCASTLE

IN GRATEFUL RECOGNITION OF A HIGH EXAMPLE

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
I	
CATHOLICISM AND SOCIETY	21
II	
CATHOLICISM AND THE SOUL	49
III	
CATHOLICISM AND THE WORLD'S FUTURE	79

Catholicism and Humanity

INTRODUCTION

OF the self-revelations of converts there is no end. It is not a little significant that most of those that appear in print are the confessions of converts to some branch of the Catholic Church. There are no palpitating volumes written to explain how a person, in some hour of awful enlightenment, passionately felt that he must become a Baptist ; or why, brought up as a Congregationalist, he must now fling himself into the arms of John Wesley. To judge from the publishers' lists, it would seem that nowadays, if not all the converts, at least nearly all those who can write, are converts to Catholicism. I make no comment upon this. If there are those who, having passed with enthusiasm into a Protestant body, and possessing some literary instinct, yet refrain from recording their experience, this may possibly be a sign of great grace. But we do not hear of such people. Meanwhile, the writings of Catholic converts about their own spiritual adventures bid fair to become a 'department' of literature.

It is scarcely my intention to add to this growing stream of books. There is no need for me to cast my slender straw, merely to show which way the current is flowing. The lectures printed here are, in the main, objective in manner and contain very little of personal reference. But perhaps no great harm will be done if I attempt a brief explanation of how it comes about that I am discovered speaking from the Anglo-Catholic standpoint, and under Anglo-Catholic auspices. It may be that what I have to say will, in some small measure, assist another wayfarer here or there. At any rate, I was brought up a Methodist, and this will account for much. There is an old negro 'spiritual' which declares,

> I'm a Methodist born and a Methodist bred,
> And when I'm gone, there 's a Methodist dead.

I think that in a particular sense this will be true of me. Methodist doctrine emphasizes the importance and value of personal experience; and the reader will pardon my readiness to give my 'testimony' when he remembers my origins. And if perchance a Methodist should glance at these pages, I beg him to consider that upon his own principle he cannot dismiss me merely because my experience happens to include a quickening of heart before the Reserved Sacrament. Of this I shall have more to say at a later stage.

Let me explain, then, that I was born and

reared in London, and although educated entirely in Anglican elementary and secondary schools, was baptized in infancy at a Methodist chapel, attended the Sunday School thereof, and after leaving school saw no more of the Church of England for many years. The Methodism in which I passed my boyhood was of somewhat untheological type, imbued with a spirit of social evangelism, and satisfied, I gathered, that it was the final and perfect form of Christianity. We lived near to a district where poverty and squalor of the most sordid kind abounded, and I had some training in visiting homes where smells took the place of food, clothing, and furniture. The chapel in which we worshipped possessed exterior and interior ugliness in remarkable balance, and was entirely devoid of ' numinous ' suggestion. Its services never conveyed to me the *mysterium tremendum*. We had a string band, an American organ, and a large choir of athletic youths and bouncing girls. And yet, chiefly because of the immense sincerity of my father and the witness of my mother's daily life under heavy trials, I came to know that the Lord Jesus Christ was the only Champion of the soul and of mankind.

I think I was about eighteen years old when I first spoke at an open-air meeting. By great sacrifices my parents had given me something of an education, and lately the opportunity of wide reading had opened to me. I had

probably received more schooling and had read more books than any one else in the crowd at the street corner that Sunday evening; but my heart turned to water and my joints were loosened as I heard the alarming sound of my own voice. The scene is even now vivid to my inward eye : the circle of listeners, strangers, and passers-by ; behind me, a few more or less prosperous Christians wearing silk hats and holding copies of Sankey's hymn-book ; and beyond the crowd, the horse-buses rolling past. When I had scrambled somehow to a conclusion, an old cab-driver, a stentorian evangelical, called me aside and told me that I ought to become a minister. His was the first word of that sort ever spoken to me, but deep in my heart a premonition of my lot had already stirred.

In due course, and most unexpectedly, the way was made clear for me. At the age of twenty I found myself a student in the United Methodist College, Manchester. I had had my times of doubt and perplexity. I had wrestled with the writings of Huxley and Haeckel, and had tried a fall or two with Herbert Spencer; but, thanks not a little to Henry Drummond's books, here I was, at length, ready to be turned into a Methodist minister. The Principal of the college was the Rev. Thomas Sherwood, a man of real philosophical scholarship, and a profound student of the mystics. He possessed intellectual distinction;

but he was something of a recluse and limelight annoyed him. His gifts deserved wider recognition than they ever received ; and I, at all events, owe him a large debt.

I was fortunate in my studies, and succeeded in winning a scholarship which took me into Manchester University. I was quite careless about reading for a degree, to the disgust of some of my tutors, and elected to browse upon a very mixed course. I sat for a time under Professor Alexander and Professor Herford. And here, too, I was taught by Professor Peake, who was at the time lecturing also in our own college—and he must be a dull fellow in whom Professor Peake can awaken no yearnings for scholarship ! But truth compels me to record that throughout my college career I never heard a single lecture upon the Sacraments; and that the only book of Church history we were required to read was the utterly inadequate work of Rudolf Sohm. Meanwhile, in vacations, I was visiting the City Temple and hearing the sermons of the Rev. R. J. Campbell. In spare hours of term-time I was reading Harnack's *History of Dogma*, Sabatier's *Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion*, and the work of Otto Pfleiderer. Already I was strong for Liberal theology, and had I been strictly pressed to distinguish my position from Unitarianism, I should have had considerable difficulty.

In the earlier days of my ministry in the

United Methodist Church I came more than once into conflict with the orthodoxy both of synods and of congregations. A reputation for theological liberalism, however, brought me an invitation from the United Methodist Church in Blackburn to become its minister; and now it seemed that my troubles were at an end, for here my heresies found tolerance. But changes were to visit me, of which I had then no inkling. There came as second minister in the circuit an old college friend of mine, the Rev. W. Whitehead, and in reading and discussion we discovered that we both were beginning to suspect the Hegelianism and liberalism which had attracted us. This is not a philosophical essay, and I need not attempt to trace exactly the path of our thought. We read Bergson and the Pragmatists, and Schiller, and for a moment we imagined that we had found our way home. We had even a Nietzschean phase. But we fell upon the writings of Tyrrell, and a new light began to shine for us. From Tyrrell we passed to Figgis, and I turned again to Newman. I suppose two years were passed in groping. We visited the Community of the Resurrection at Mirfield, and talked over our position with Dr. Frere, then the Superior. He wisely bade us wait and pray, gave us practical advice, and offered to help us at any future time.

Then burst upon us, and upon our theological adventuring, the Great War; and in that

cataclysm, as if with scales falling from my eyes, I saw the futility of man apart from a supernatural salvation. But I was not in the least inclined to retreat upon the evangelical position of Methodism, for I saw the need of a supernatural society, a Holy Catholic Church; and since I had already reached a belief in the Incarnation, I could no longer doubt that the historic Church was the divinely founded Society of Redemption. I wished, indeed, to proclaim the evangelical truth to souls; but I realized that it was flatly impossible for me to become an 'evangelical,' except in a Catholic environment and with the Catholic implications. I could not, however, agree straightway to abandon the Methodism in which I had been reared. I remembered that it had at least declared that Jesus was God, while I had been offering various German hypotheses to account for Him. I felt the need of a great uprising of church-consciousness in the Free Churches, and at the moment I knew only of two persons who felt similarly. One was the Rev. W. Whitehead and the other was Dr. Orchard.

I had met Dr. Orchard once or twice when he was minister of S. Paul's Presbyterian Church, Enfield; and I had, of course, known the writings which reflected his association with the liberal movement in English theology. I was impressed by my first sight and hearing of him. Mr. Philip Snowden once told me that he considered Dr. Orchard to be the most

surprising combination of opposites he had ever met. In those days he possessed boyish gaiety with immense intellectual power: and still he holds a flickering, illuminating humour, wide scholarship, deep spirituality, in some strange synthesis. I was taken by his strong and daring democratic sympathies, and by his wonderful ability as a preacher. I had more recently detected in him signs of a change of religious outlook; and when I heard of the line he was pursuing at the King's Weigh House Church, I wrote to him. He immediately introduced me to the Rev. J. M. Lloyd Thomas and the Free Catholic Movement, and before long I found myself very much in the thick of things.

At the end of 1918 my first book, *The Coming Free Catholicism*, made its appearance. Mr. Kensit was speedily upon my track, and I imagine not a few Methodists were wondering at this strange freak produced in their midst. Within a week or two, however, I received a letter from Canon Osborne, Rector of Wallsend (then known to me only through his writings), warmly congratulating me upon my work; and this was followed by dozens of similar letters from Anglo-Catholics in every corner of England. Moreover, while Nonconformist reviewers, attempting to speak kindly, were evidently somewhat scandalized, and a Low Churchman reviewing the book in the *Nation* was full of wrath, and the *Tablet* seemed not to know quite how to treat this thing, I noticed

that the *Church Times* was most cordial and generous in its praise. This revealed to me unsuspected friendliness in a quarter from which I had not dared to hope for much, and seemed, to my mind, to show that Catholicism in the English Church was not imperviously hidebound.

In the operation of the Methodist system I left Blackburn in 1919 for Newcastle-upon-Tyne. The following year I published *From Chaos to Catholicism*. This book, for some reason unknown to me, received a more favourable treatment at the hands of Nonconformist critics; but I was approaching a period of sore inward perplexity. My ever-present difficulty was that in Methodism I could find no opportunity of expressing Catholic sympathies in visible form, or of building up the elements of Catholic consciousness in my people. My own congregation was not intolerant. They gave me 'liberty of prophesying' and much personal affection, and they allowed me to make several modifications in the worship. But the circuit system and the itinerancy of the ministry destroyed continuity of work; and the denominational authority over individual churches made any striking advance impossible.

I realized, too, that I was now drawing most of my spiritual sustenance through Catholic channels. I was relying upon the Catholicism of history and accomplished fact for my own moral support. The majority of my close

associates were Catholics. Anglican priests were making me constantly welcome in their midst and treating me as a brother. Throughout this time I was sustained by the understanding friendship of Canon Osborne, the Rev. A. E. Cornibeer, and other Anglo-Catholics. I began to see that I must seriously consider my path ; and, had a road opened, I might have entered the Church at any moment. Upon holidays I always sought out an Anglo-Catholic church wherein to worship. I was many times at S. Luke's, Enfield, and the vicar, the Rev. B. H. S. Lethbridge, did not hesitate to tell me where he thought my future lay. In the midst of my work in Newcastle, I wandered often into Anglican and Roman churches—most often into S. John's, in Grainger Street, and the Mission of the Holy Spirit where the Blessed Sacrament was reserved.

I wish to say that the Reserved Sacrament was to me, in those days, so precious a comfort, that I cannot imagine what I should have done without it. I could not make a Catholic communion, because I had never been confirmed, nor could I say that I was actually desirous of being confirmed, since that would have meant that I had solved my problem. But at least I could kneel and pray in silence before the sacramental presence of our Lord, and this I did full often. I suppose some would consider me a fetish-worshipper, or at best a sentimentalist. Yet I have read an amount of

philosophy: am temperamentally sceptical; and am quite aware of the difference between magic and spiritual religion. I had come to the full sacramental position from a study of metaphysics and economics, and I found the Reserved Sacrament a sure means of rest and strength. I know that there I met our Lord as I had not met Him before; for, without raising questions about Free Church Sacraments, I myself, when celebrating, was often too distracted by the problems involved in the mode of celebration to receive very much benefit.

In 1923 I published *The Values of the Sacrament*, with an Introduction by Dr. Orchard, and I began to know that the practical position was becoming impossible. The book was read by Baron von Hügel not many months before his death, and he wrote me an exceedingly kind letter of appreciation. It was also reviewed in the *Church Times* by the late Mrs. E. Herman, and praised beyond its merits. It was even treated temperately by Methodist papers: two of them were almost enthusiastic, in spite of the book's full acceptance of the Catholic sacramental position. But I knew that having travelled thus far, I should have no more peace until I had come into the communion of the historic Church. It was not that I had become dissatisfied with the Free Catholic vision. The Basis of the Society of Free Catholics provides the only philosophy of reunion that I, for one, could ever accept—and I may say this more

readily, since I had no part in its composition. Even less was there any lessening of friendship between myself and other Free Catholics. For Dr. Orchard I have the warmest admiration and affection, and I believe that he has a most significant work to do for the whole Church of God. And I count Mr. Lloyd Thomas among the prophets. But Free Catholicism does not pretend to be a Church; and I must have an altar ; I must no longer stand apart from that living tradition of communion which is the Catholic Church.

Through all this time I was speaking and lecturing busily enough—in London, Birmingham, and the North, at Oxford University, at ministers' ' fraternals ' in many places. In this way I came to meet that remarkable servant of God, the Rev. J. S. L. Burn of Middlesbrough. Twice he persuaded me to visit his town and address the clergy and Nonconformist ministers upon certain theological issues involved in reunion; and I count myself fortunate in coming to know him, even at the end of his days. I was also carrying on a considerable correspondence for the Society of Free Catholics. Letters reached me from America, Germany, France, Austria, India — even from the Philippine Islands. But all this activity did not stifle my own trouble. I could proclaim, but might not practise, a fully Catholic ideal; and I was away from the historic continuity of Christ's Society. That, to me, became less and less an

academic question, and increasingly a clear moral issue.

I had, of course, turned my eyes more than once toward Rome. I could not have entered the Roman priesthood, for a reason of definite, though joyous, domestic fact. But I had prayed that if it were God's will, He would make me ready for any sacrifice, and to join the Roman Church as a layman. Had I done this, I might perhaps have taken up political work. This had previously attracted me, and I had taken part in some stormy elections. I was personally known to some of the Labour leaders. I had twice 'taken the chair' for Mr. G. Bernard Shaw at great meetings. In Blackburn I had known Mr. Philip Snowden very well, and still corresponded occasionally with him. In Newcastle I had made the acquaintance of Mr. Charles Trevelyan, and had given him a little assistance in his battles. Yet, although a prominent member of the Labour Party declared that I was wasting my time in the ministry, I could not now have taken up with any kind of political livelihood with much zeal. I think I had learned too well the joys and perils of another and higher calling. But I sincerely believe that had I been convinced of the validity of the Roman claim, I would have ceased from the ministry at all costs. In perfect truth, so far as a sinner's mind may discern it, I can say that I did not eventually feel that the Roman Church of to-day was my appointed place. I have

experienced her fascinating power. I retain an enormous respect for her. But I considered that unless it were demonstrated that the English Church was historically cut off and actually un-Catholic, I must at length find myself within her borders.

I was unconvinced by the Roman case against the Church of England. Since the practical abandonment of the argument against the succussion of the Anglican Episcopate, the Roman objection to Anglican Orders had the appearance of nagging about comparatively small points : and upon the question of the Ordinal the Anglican reply seemed to me sufficient. A much larger and more vital question was that of the future of the Catholic idea and of the Catholic Society. I understood, indeed, that the Tridentine Reformation had been wonderfully effective in certain respects ; but I could not bring myself to imagine that the rigidity and centralization of the modern Roman system were to be accepted as expressing the sole and final form of that divine and historic Society in which, through the centuries, some other, and as I thought, finer traits had sometimes manifested themselves.

I wanted a Catholicism which should be both a little more historical and a little more modern than the Romanism of our time. I mean that I desired a little more sense of the realities involved in the disruption of Christendom than I could find in the ordinary Roman

position; and I wanted a more thoroughgoing realization of the modern mind, in its more serious and considerable aspects, than Rome appeared to possess. Chiefly, perhaps, I desired to hear Catholicism sounding the trumpet of rescue from our social ills, and to speak truth, it was not my fortune to meet Roman Catholics who were particularly interested in this. Finally, I concluded that the restoration of Catholicism throughout the world must involve a more exquisite adaptation of temper to racial and national character than Rome seemed disposed to adopt. I considered that since the English people and the English genius were facts beyond dispute, a full Catholicism in England would express itself through the medium of that genius, and that only such a Catholicism could hope vitally to modify the modern nationalism. This may seem a paradox ; but I observed that the vaunted internationalism of Rome had failed to grasp and mould nationalism in a super-national synthesis; for it had been quite unable to prevent Frenchmen and Bavarians, Austrians and Italians, from slaughtering one another. It appeared to me that the obvious ' efficiency ' of Rome failed in imagination and in subtle appreciation of the finer and profounder issues.

When I turned from Rome to the Church of England, I saw, of course, much that was lamentable: confusion, uncertainty, and lingering vestiges of pride and smugness. But I could

not help seeing signs of stirring life. I saw a Church which I considered upon objective grounds to be strictly and formally in the Catholic succession, and yet unmistakably English. Indeed, her actual condition seemed to present, in somewhat disorderly manner, a veritable pageant of English history. Nevertheless, I saw that this Church was in living touch with modern forces; and at the same time was producing an increasing movement of Catholic life, touched with a certain romantic flame, eager and adventurous. It seemed to me highly probable that the Catholic movement would eventually become the characterizing force within this Church—not by merely outmanœuvring and banishing its rivals, but by absorbing and utilizing all that was vital and valid in the Evangelical and Modernist philosophies. I reflected, too, that this Church was spread over a considerable part of the world, in an Empire which was now assuming the form of a commonwealth of nations. And thus I concluded that this Church might become of central significance in that consolidation of Christendom which I believed to be the world's chief and crying need. This, I said, is my mother; and how am I straitened until I come home.

My friend, William Whitehead, had already taken the step. He had sounded the depths of despair in Methodism, and having received Orders was now curate at Habergham, Burnley. The time came for me to leave Newcastle-on-

Tyne, and to pass to Leeds. Within little more than six months, I made my decision. Before leaving Newcastle I had again visited Mirfield, this time at the invitation of Father Talbot, the Superior of the Community, who had been reading *The Values of the Sacrament*, and had shown much interest in the book. With Father Talbot I had discussed my situation very frankly, and he had said that though I might be doing well to remain in Methodism as long as possible, he believed the time was approaching when I must come into the English Church; and he had expressed readiness to introduce me to a bishop who would make my transition as easy as possible, in consonance with Church order.

In Leeds I soon learned that the day of my departure was at hand. I had no real complaint to make of my treatment at the hands of Methodists. The denominational officials had shown me consistent personal consideration, and had regularly placed in the waste-paper basket the numerous letters they received from the followers of Mr. Kensit. The Rochdale Synod had made me its chairman at what I believe to have been an unprecedentedly early age. The Newcastle Synod had elected me its theological examiner. Methodist ministers had always met me in cordial relations. But the spiritual ties were fast slackening, and no bonds of mere companionship and old association must be allowed to restrain me any longer.

Introduced by Father Talbot, I saw the Bishop of Manchester who, I believe, had already some acquaintance with my work. He received me with great sympathy, diligently smoothed my path, eventually ordaining me deacon in Manchester Cathedral at Michaelmas, 1925, and priesting me at the following Lent.

My Methodist friends took the separation with good will. I employed the time between making my decision and being ordained in finishing *The Divine Society*, which was published by the Student Christian Movement while I was in retreat for ordination. And then, not without trepidation, I entered upon a new stage of life. Speaking from within the Church, I desire to say that I am unconscious of having sacrificed a single religious principle. I have all that I ever had, and much more, of divine consolation. Not for worlds would I retrace my steps.

I believe that Catholicism in the English Church is destined to work mightily for the good of the world. I know something of the difficulties that beset it, and how it is peculiarly troubled by controversies which have to do with the adoption of modern Roman devotions. My own hope is that Anglo-Catholics, making sure of the Catholic foundations of their faith and practice, will have the courage to copy, or not to copy, Rome, in these other things, according as they are led by prayer, by thought,

and by experience within their own part of the Catholic Church. But I am not bold to suppose that I can teach any lessons to men who have been in the battle for many years. And, on the other hand, I dread to appear pertly critical of those English Churchmen who stand apart from the Catholic movement. Yet I think they will not be unduly resentful of the opinions of one who has spent twenty years in Nonconformist ministry, and may claim to know Liberal Protestantism and Evangelicalism as well as most people.

One can do no more than offer himself in response to such vision as has been vouchsafed to his dim sight, and this I desire to do. I was told that when my passing over to the English Church became known, Mr. Kensit put up a notice in the window of his shop to warn the public that having done my best to corrupt Methodism, I was now coming to assist in the corruption of the Church of England; but that this was only preliminary to my final passage into the Church of Rome. I think that the journey to Rome is not in the least likely to be made. It seems to me that the Anglo-Catholic adventure is lofty enough to occupy a man's whole thought and energy, in however lowly a place his lot may be cast. I was advised by a Nonconformist of some standing that in coming into the Church I was ruining my career. He said, 'They will put you in some corner and forget all about you, and you will

never be heard of any more.' Quite possibly. It does not in the least matter. A man must be sufficiently grateful if, amidst all the crowding perplexities of this brief life, he can, in some crisis of judgement, rise up and do the right. If he truly feels that he has done this, he can bear with the consequences.

NOTE

THESE lectures were delivered in the early part of this year at the Church Institute, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, at the request of the Newcastle-upon-Tyne Anglo-Catholic Congress Committee. I wish to express my gratitude to the members of that Committee for their invitation, and for the generous reception they gave me.

I

CATHOLICISM AND SOCIETY

THE subject of this lecture is Catholicism and Society. Let me say, first of all, that whether certain people like it or not, the Catholic movement in the English Church is without doubt the most significant and the most virile religious activity of our time in this country. Why I believe this will appear as we proceed. But it is not the only movement of our time, even in the Church of England. The inclusiveness of our Church, indeed, sometimes presents the appearance of hopeless confusion and an unpromising field for a Catholic revival.

If, by Catholicism, we mean an entirely static traditionalism, for which all theology was finally determined at the Chalcedonian period, and for which all practice, down to small details, must conform to one particular type; or if we mean a rigid ordering of thought and habit by a highly centralized, repressive, and dictatorial authority, claiming infallibility for its verdicts—then I suppose we must admit that this Church of England is not a specially happy sphere for our endeavours. But if by Catholicism we mean the religion for all men, and for the whole

man, the man in the twentieth century, as well as for the man in the first and the fifth and the thirteenth centuries; a religion for mind and heart and will ; a religion which can absorb and utilize every genuine human development, while holding firmly to its own foundations and preserving the whole body of its Faith ; a religion in which personal experience and personal initiative are held in real and rich fusion with corporate loyalty — then the Catholic movement in the Church of England has a great and important contribution to make to the welfare of the Holy Catholic Church.

For in the English Church historic Catholicism is in close touch and veritable communion with living modern forces. At the same time, an informed English Catholicism has an immense strategical advantage over Evangelicalism or Modernism. They cannot absorb or include it, as an element in their self-expression; but it can include and employ whatever is really true and really Christian in them. And I believe it will do so. Consequently, if I am to speak of the significance of Catholicism for Humanity, I believe that I can present the strongest argument, speaking as a Catholic of the English obedience. I hope to make this plain in these lectures, and to some extent now, as we consider the implications which Catholicism possesses for human society.

It needs only a glance at the actual situation of man in this world, to see that while he is

obviously a social being, while the noblest part of his nature is concerned with the relations of fellowship, while the most magnificent and awe-inspiring chapters of his history are those which record his attempts to construct durable social forms, yet, nevertheless, here his failure is most apparent, and appears in the most tragic shapes. Here we behold a perpetual frustration. Here we feel the burden of all the broken empires. Here we find the pressure of all economic strife and international rivalry. Man's societies have not endured. His civilizations have come to swift collapse or to slow decay. The will to society is ever in conflict with some centrifugal force which produces chaos. We find it in the modern state. We find it in political parties. We find it in a cricket club. We find that it has spoiled, though it has never destroyed, even the Church. And the question with which we are immediately confronted is whether there may be discovered any principle or power of permanent cohesion, and if so, what is it? What shall eventually consolidate humanity? What shall overcome the disruptive forces of selfishness?

The answer is that the necessary principle and power can never be found upon the natural plane. That conclusion was firmly established, ages ago, as the result of Greek thought and experience. And we can safely assert that the only force which can bind into an harmonious whole the errant wills of men, constructing, out

of all types, classes, and nations, one fellowship and communion, must be found in the contact of men with invisible and spiritual reality. In other words, it must be a religion.

One potent source of our modern muddle is the solemn belief, held by multitudes of our fellow-countrymen, that religion is a purely private affair, a secret 'between a man and his God,' as the phrase goes, much as a man's banking account is a secret between him and his bank manager. This is one of those half-truths that are more dangerous than any complete lie. It is, of course, true, in the sense that a man's attitude to God is the most important thing about him, influences the profoundest depths of his personality, and must, moreover, be ultimately determined by the exercise of his own thought, affection, and will. But it is false in the sense that it is impossible to keep a man's religion from affecting his attitude toward everything else; and that his attitude to God and his attitude to his fellow men, his daily work and his daily bread, are inextricably connected. The whole assumption that religion can be private in the sense that it need have no regulative influence upon the visible structure of society is one of the modern superstitions. The notion that religion itself is not normally the strongest of all associating forces, transmuting the individual in a formative society, and that it can possess a man and yet leave him still an isolated unit, is a modern myth.

Of course it arose in reaction against certain mechanical views, which regarded religion as a cut and dried system toward which the individual need be no more than passive. It was a thing provided for him by the powers that be, so that he had no more right to a private religion of his own than to a private system of law. Unfortunately the reaction went too far. Men came to think that although it was impossible for each man to have his own private law, it was quite possible for each man to have his own private God. And the assumption underlying this belief was that which has characterized the whole modern social and political development, the assumption that what men believe about God can make no difference to their method of conducting practical affairs, cannot affect their politics, economics, industry, or international relations.

But the Catholic conception of religion declares that the Saviour of the soul is the Saviour of society; that the only religion which is ultimately true for each man is true for all men; and that the religion which governs the secret heart of one must, as all men come to receive it, govern the entire relation of all. And Catholicism involves all this, when it says that the Church, the one Christian Society, is an essential and fundamental feature of the Christian religion.

Primitively, of course, religion was thoroughly corporate. It was not the possession of an

individual, but rather of some particular tribe, race, or city, expressing the life of that definite and limited society. Indeed, I think it can be said that religion emerged largely as a mode of social consciousness.[1] Instinctively men sought a divine foundation for their social life. The people of Athens were the people of Athena, either by blood-descent, or because they lived in Athena's territory. The Hebrews were the people of Yahweh, by His choice. You notice that the religion is coterminous with the race or tribe. It is limited. It has nothing to do with other peoples; nor can foreigners have anything to do with it for it is a thing which a man cannot choose. It is his natural heritage. He may be false to its sanctions—which is the same thing as being a traitor to his people; but in order to be religious he is not required to be in any sort of personal relation with the god. Indeed, at this stage, the private pursuit of the god is looked upon with suspicion, as though a man were trying to gain favours for himself. But this stage could not last. Man had yet to face a certain stupendous problem, a problem which has engaged him ever since and presses with the utmost severity upon his mind to-day: the problem of how personality, as it becomes increasingly aware of itself, can be held within the social bond.

It is very instructive to observe how Greek

[1] This must not be confounded with Durkheim's view, in which society is the real object of religion and worship.

thought dealt with this problem. The older Sophists began by observing that since other peoples had their customs and laws—their moralities, as we should say—it was obviously impossible to suppose that the real origin of morality was any local deity. There was an underlying and universal morality, accepted by all men. What was its origin? They gave no clear answer to the question; but some of the radical Sophists answered it by explaining that the only universal law was self-interest, and that this was the cause of society: the many weak had banded together to protect themselves against the few strong.

This of course was quite subversive of society and morality, and it was against such conclusions that both Plato and Aristotle laboured, to erect society upon a sure, if invisible, foundation. Plato held that society had come into existence because the soul was created for communion with the eternal Idea of the Good, and this end could be attained only in and through social relations. And Aristotle, though he criticized his master upon many points, was virtually at one with him here, in so far that he held that society was the necessary means of moral life. But when Plato came to set out in detail the nature of an ideal society, he fell disastrously short in two ways.

He would have a society founded upon communion with the eternal Idea of the Good, drawing its guidance and government from that

Idea. But he held that this communion was to be shared only by a few people—the philosophers : and all the others must do as the philosophers bade them. But this means that the majority have no contact or communion with the spiritual ground of the society. It means that they are not really members of society in any true sense. Therefore there is no genuine moral tie between them, and there is no guarantee against that disloyalty and strife which have always ruined human fellowship. They have no experience of that spiritual reality which Plato declares to be the basis of human association : hence they are left without true social motive. If they obey the philosophers, it cannot be because they know the philosophers have a vision of the Idea of the Good. They cannot tell. And they must obey the philosophers as they would obey any other tyrants.

In the second place, Plato, while holding that the Idea of the Good was the only cause of all society, nevertheless gives us an ideal republic which is not in relation with the rest of mankind, and which he expects to be frequently at war with other States. That is to say, he supposed that there could be an ideal society which was not also a universal society. He never faced the task of attaining universal brotherhood and peace on earth. Nor did Aristotle remedy these shortcomings. Thus the Greeks failed to solve the problem theoretically.

What actually happened was that there arose

the Macedonian Empire, drawing the Greek States into one organization. But at the same time we see the divorce of religion from the social structure. Antiochus might be called Epiphanes, a divine manifestation, but real religious feeling was running in the direction of the mystery cults, and the problem of personal deliverance from a hopeless world ; just as in Rome, at a later time, the worship of the Emperor became a kind of official religion of society, while people were seeking to satisfy their hearts with the cult of Mithras and various Eastern religions which had no pretence to any relation with the actual social and political order.

I fear this discussion has been rather dry ; but it is important for the understanding of our subject. Let us see what we have learned. Men instinctively requiring a religious ground and sanction for their society, sought it in a tribal, racial, or local god. When they found themselves entering into wider social relations, they looked for another basis of society; but they could not find it in philosophy, or what they discovered in philosophy they could not apply in practice. Wider societies were built up by political growth or by military conquest, without any adequate religious development to support them. The old religions of tribe or city faded away. The religious basis of the new empires was found in declaring the divinity of the earthly ruler, though this was never more

than a formality. Real religion became only a personal and private thing : and therefore both the new religions and the new empires were destined to fail. And in all this, there is but an example of the truth that there is something wrong with mankind. It cannot develop naturally into fully-rounded perfection. It cannot produce perfect personality and perfect society in true relations. It stumbles and loses its way ; and if it is to be saved, help must come into this world from beyond this world.

Now, the Catholic Faith declares that the truest and deepest personal religion is at the same time the only true and abiding social foundation. Moreover, it says that this religion is intended for the whole human race. In other words, the only hope, both for the soul and for society, is Jesus Christ. But Christianity, though it is the answer to the theoretical problems raised specially in ancient Greece, is still more the answer to the practical problems raised specially amongst another people, the Jews. To their great teachers, problems of action had always seemed more important than problems of thought. And they saw, more clearly than any one else had done, that the real difficulty was sin. The prophets rose to the conception of a personal religion which should be a universal religion; but what stood in the way, what produced the discord and confusion of this world, was the actual misdirection of the human will which they called sin. And so they

came to look for the redemptive action of God, and to them was given the hope of a Saviour.

The Christian Faith holds that this hope was fulfilled in our Blessed Lord. He Who stood always within the society of the Blessed Trinity came and stood within the forlorn and broken societies of men. And let us see how the Faith answers the ancient difficulties. Our Lord invites every living soul into fellowship with Himself. That, undoubtedly, is one of the great notes of the Gospel, and it is the basis of evangelical religion. This is the answer to Plato and Aristotle, who despaired of the mass of men and put their hopes in a moral and intellectual aristocracy. Plato could not imagine the ordinary man beholding the Idea of the Good. It was like a distant star, too remote for most eyes. But the Faith says that the dayspring from on high has visited us, and that all men may see and know it. It declares that the most degraded, the most ignorant, the most obscure, may be brought into such personal touch with Christ, that their hearts and lives may be changed. And true Catholicism is always evangelical. It never misses this great truth. If there is any church where this is forgotten, then lights and vestments do not make it truly Catholic. But there are scores of Anglo-Catholic churches in vile slums, where the evangelical truth is put into practice every day. The Christian Faith deals with persons, and

Catholicism which is truly Catholic never forgets that.

But this dealing with persons as individuals does not exhaust the Gospel message. A great modern philosopher has said that the individual apart from society is as much an abstraction as is society apart from the individual. A person is a person because he is a social being. And a redeemed person can only be a redeemed person because he is in a redeemed society. His soul can be built on Christ, only within a society which is built on Christ. Therefore our Lord not only invited all men into fellowship with Himself; but He preached a redeemed human fellowship and founded it. He trained a company of disciples who were to be His Apostles, and were to rule over His Society. And at the last moment of His earthly ministry, before His betrayal, He instituted a most solemn bond between them, declaring that bread and wine, in which they all shared, were His own Body and Blood; and that they were to go on doing this thing. And that surely means a new bond amongst men, and one which must affect all their relations.

This was the new Society: a new start in human affairs. It was destined to convert and revolutionize not only individuals, but nations and empires, and eventually the whole family of mankind. For unquestionably our Lord intended His Society to become universal. His Gospel was to be carried to all the world. And

so we have here the supernatural foundation of society come amongst men. It touches every heart, but it builds a kingdom. And that kingdom is to receive all the honour and glory of the nations. It comes, not merely as an idea, but as a moral and spiritual force, a transforming power. It is here to make a new world. And what we have now to do, as briefly as possible, is to see how Catholic Christianity interprets these facts. For this purpose I am going to lay down four propositions.

1. The first is, *that the Society which Christ came to found exists in the Church.* This firm belief about the Church persistently maintains itself in Catholic Christianity, and nowhere else. The whole Catholic position involves the belief that the Church is a necessary means of human salvation, because the redemption of the world can never be wrought out through isolated individuals. The reply to all purely individualistic notions of Christianity is a reply of fact—man is not merely an individual, and our Lord never treated him as such. But the question does arise, as to whether we are justified in asserting that the Church is actually the redeemed Society and not rather the temporary means of securing a redeemed society. That is a view of the Church which has grown up in Protestantism. The true end, it is said, is the kingdom of God: the Church is one means, amongst others, of reaching that end, but no more than a means. But I believe that to be a false view, incapable

of logical statement. We all agree that the kingdom of God must be a wider thing than attending Mass and hearing sermons. But the very heart of that kingdom must be the new relation, the new fellowship, of men in Christ. And unless we believe that this is actually accomplished within the Church, we shall be reduced to the admission that the Church's Sacraments are unavailing—perhaps shadowy indications of a reality yet to be, but not in themselves imparting any new reality. The new Society must be supernaturally grounded, and therefore it must have as its centre a fellowship of sacrament and prayer.

I believe that this Society must eventually dominate and absorb all other forms of human association, that it will include in its activities mining and bricklaying, teaching and weaving, painting and literature, and all the necessary modes of human activity; and that will be a Christocracy—it will be the kingdom of God. This may allow of wide varieties of cultural type. The kingdom of God will not reduce us all to a bald and barren identity. Racial, national, temperamental varieties will doubtless be preserved for the common enrichment; but the whole society of man will be one in Christ. This, however, will not be the abrogation and surpassing of that society which is already realized in the communion of the Church. It will be the application of that communion to all the world's affairs. There can be no kingdom,

except upon the grounds which the Church lays down. There will be no kingdom except by the gateway of the Sacraments. The Church is not merely the forerunner of the kingdom. It is the foundation of the kingdom.

There are many people who think they are quite ready for the kingdom, because they feel so superior to the Church. They find creeds rather crude, to their lofty intelligence, and Sacraments rather a nuisance. And they can't stand the vicar! Well, they must learn to stand him, and many other poor, imperfect people. And they must learn the Faith. And they must begin with bread and wine becoming the Body and Blood of Christ, before they can hope to see the Bank of England and the House of Commons become temples of the living God.[1] The Church is not here to symbolize a coming salvation of men, but to impart a present salvation which is within her power to give. Her duty is not to entertain people, but to solve, before her altars, the age-long problem of human strife and discord; and from her pulpits to proclaim the application of this new peace and goodwill to all private and public concerns.

Of this we may be quite sure: men and nations will find no firm and lasting peace until the Church of Gospel and Sacrament is once again restored to true leadership, and to

[1] Of course, it may be doubted whether institutions remotely resembling these could find any place in the kingdom of God.

the position of the home and abiding-place of mankind. The Church is always dealing with the chief and central problem of humanity. She is bound to claim that she can effectively answer this problem. She claims to be humanity actually in fellowship with God. And therefore Catholicism is profoundly right, logically, ethically, and spiritually right, in holding that the Church is essential for man's salvation.

2. The second proposition is *that persons are redeemed into this Society;* and Catholic Christianity asserts that the inauguration of this process of the incorporation of the individual takes place *in the sacrament of Baptism.* Upon this point the doctrine of the Church has to meet two lines of very vigorous attack. In the first place it is said by some that since what is wrought out in redemption is a spiritual effect, no outward act of the Church can affect the status of any soul. The reply is that we know the spiritual only through its incarnations: that the Church is itself a visible and incarnate society; and that incorporation thereinto must be marked by a visible act. What may or may not be accomplished in that act depends upon the nature and intention of the Church. If the Church is the Body of Christ, then it is the instrument for associating men with Him, and its sacramental acts are owned and honoured by the Lord Himself. As we have seen, the problem of redemption is not one of regenerating a series of isolated individuals, but of re-

generating persons who are by nature social. The onus is upon any lover of Christ to show why he should not be baptized. If he is genuinely under a misapprehension, and is perfectly honest and humble, I believe the Church will not say that he is cut off—though no other society would make any such generous allowance.

Along the second line of attack it is said that at all events the baptism of a child not many days old cannot possibly have any effect upon that child; and that, if it had, we should have no right to commit children in this way, before they can choose for themselves. It seems to be forgotten that parents actually bring children into the world and commit them to a human existence before they can choose for themselves: that they go to the registrar of births, and commit their children to British nationality before they can choose for themselves. The child is committed to the earthly society—the broken and imperfect society of the world, without its own consent. And what Christian Baptism declares is that since Christ died for the whole race, any member of the race must be accorded the privilege of entrance to Christ's Society at the outset of his existence. He may afterwards be false to the Church, false to the Faith. But he may be equally false to his country or to his family. The possibility that his baby may turn out a forger or a murderer, does not prevent Mr. Smith from reckoning the baby as a little

Smith. The possibility that the baby may turn out a great sinner does not prevent the Church from receiving it into the family of God.

What Christ did for the race, Baptism applies to the individual. It incorporates him into the Church. And the real emphasis and significance of that act is that the Church is a new start in human society. Nobody is born a member of the Church. We are born into a society which cannot save us because it cannot save itself. But by divine grace we are placed in a Society founded by a definite, historic act of God, and thus differentiated from every other visible corporation in the world. A child is a member of a family, and a member of a nation, long before it knows anything about the family or the nation. Yet the family influence and the national influence are already at work upon him. So the child is taken into the Church, and in Baptism he is received into the active environment of grace.

Here we have again the emphatic assertion that the Church is utterly necessary for social salvation. Only with her spiritual bond existing among men can mankind develop in enduring fellowship. This means that without the Church all human society is crippled and corrupted. This is distasteful to many optimistic humanists; but I will ask you to consider the fact that since the Church came into the world, the world has seen the unparalleled spectacle of a tradition of civilization, never

broken as the ancient empires were broken : never ossified as the Chinese civilization was ossified; but drawing a vast variety of races into itself, marching through centuries of amazing changes, and ever claiming the whole world as its rightful sphere. There is nothing else like this in all history.

3. The third proposition is that *this Society is one and continuous*. Obviously, there cannot be more than a single human fellowship in Christ. It is unthinkable that our Lord, in drawing men to Himself, should draw them only into cliques. I must be prepared to meet all Christian men in Christ. The whole notion of a sectarian Christianity is based upon a quite inadequate conception of the Church. The Church cannot be universal unless it is one, for universality must be the universality of some one thing. But the universality of the Church refers not only to any one time, but to the whole of history subsequent to our Lord's earthly life. A visible, incarnate society cannot disappear and reappear at different periods, and maintain its identity. It cannot be anything like the Cheshire cat. The Church must be visibly continuous, because the human race is visibly continuous. It must be a perpetually existing communion upon earth.

Now, since not even the Roman Church is any longer very ready to hold that we Anglicans have broken our connection with the historic episcopate, we can justly hold that

although we are not in communion with modern Rome, we are still in communion with the ancient and mediaeval Church of the West. Indeed, we are thus in communion with the whole ancient Church. It seems to me that it is futile to look for any reunion of Christian people which does not respect the fact of historic continuity.

I know quite well that many Free Churchmen feel that there is something mechanical about the way in which we conceive this continuity. Those who do feel the need of any continuity at all, say that it must be truly spiritual and organic, and cannot be secured merely by the tactual succession of bishops. But no thinking Catholic believes that a mere tactual succession of isolated individuals secures anything at all. A bishop is not a mere isolated individual. He is the accepted organ and representative of Christ and His Church—or he is nothing at all. And what Apostolic succession means is precisely that a spiritual society is prepared to declare and manifest its identity through all time; and therefore, those denominations which refuse this outward sign of the one grace must show tremendous reasons, or they must be convicted of reducing to absurdity those outward signs which they themselves employ to mark their own continued identity. If one can lightly reject the historic form, and still be in the one Church, then one can refuse the forms of any modern denomination, and

still be in the denomination. But as a matter of fact, you cannot be a Methodist minister unless you have been ordained in a particular way.

One reason why I was willing that the Bishop of Manchester should place his hands upon my head was that I had come to realize that my reasons for refusing were not sufficiently tremendous. I saw that I was participating in a breach for which there was no sufficient excuse: and I was therefore cutting myself off from the constituted channels of grace. If you believe in any idea of the Church at all, you will never find it easy to explain why you have broken with those signs which for long ages declared that there was only one Church; and even if we admit that in the Apostolic age, and even in the sub-Apostolic age, the precise forms of the Christian ministry are not completely clear, it is nevertheless certain that from the end of the first century onward the Church organized itself under bishops, without any convulsion or upheaval, and that for much more than a thousand years the succession of bishops, believed to be the successors of the Apostles, was the universal pledge of the Church's identity and continuity amongst Christian men.

The enormous importance of assured continuity is not that men shall have exactly the same religious ideas from age to age, or precisely the same limited practice from age to age, but that through all ages they shall know themselves to be in the veritable Society founded by Christ.

That Society can be only one. It cannot stop, and start again after a period of non-existence. It cannot change into something entirely different from its original self. It must be itself, the one visible redeemed Society of Christ.

People say, 'It can be this, without paying attention to externals.' But as a matter of fact, the externals are only questioned when there is something spiritually wrong. A woman never looks askance at her wedding ring until she has quarrelled with her husband. A spiritual unity will keep the visible signs, and honour them. The Church which is one, will desire to give pledges of its identity through all time. There may be, there will be, developments of thought and method; but any development which tends to decrease or change the meaning of the Church as the continuous act of Christ is certainly wrong. For only as any body of Christian men can declare itself to be identically one with the Society founded by Christ, can it rightly claim that revolutionary dominion in this world which the Church ought to claim. That is why Catholics hold so tenaciously to historic continuity. If in any breach or rupture, some held to the historic sign and some departed from it, there is a strong presupposition that on the whole the former were right, no matter what may be said about particular points of the quarrel.

4. And thus we come to our fourth and final proposition, *that this Society is completely revolu-*

tionary in principle, and is intended to become supreme in this world. A great number of good people grow impatient with our ecclesiastical discussions, because they see the practical need of saving the world and are anxious to get on with that great business. But I have asked you to consider the actual foundation and nature of the Christian Society, because, until this is settled, we can get no further. And now I will maintain that this Society of Christ is revolutionary in three ways.

(*a*) First, in the way it relates matter and spirit. I believe it is true that the relation of matter and spirit taught by the Catholic Faith is an unique conception. Upon either side of it we find a great variety of notions, from the crudest materialism upon one side to extreme Manicheism upon the other. But the Faith says that the Word was made Flesh, and that common bread and wine may become the Body and Blood of Christ. Believing this, it cannot find anything evil in material things, but only in their misuse; and it thus goes on to declare that the deliberate employment of material things in worship is not only harmless, but positively Christian and positively good.

Some time ago, I went with a Nonconformist friend of mine into a great Anglo-Catholic church. He looked round, and said : ' Beautiful—but quite pagan.' When we had got outside, I asked him to explain what on earth he was talking about. I asked him if he had seen

any image of Mars or Bacchus. Whose Figure was on the rood ? Whose Sacrament reserved in the chapel ? He explained that he meant that the whole philosophy of the place was pagan, because it was an appeal to the senses. And then I went for him. I said, ' Who made the senses ? What is God doing with sunsets and flowers ? ' And I told him that I had once been in his chapel at a harvest festival, and the most conspicuous thing in the building was a vegetable marrow. His choir had sung two anthems in one service. Surely these things were concerned with the senses. Of course the whole Catholic symbolism is an appeal through every possible avenue of the soul, to the soul itself, and all in the Name of Christ; and, what is more, it is an offering to God of all that God has given us.

But the great idea of matter as the instrument of spirit cannot be confined to crucifixes and pictures, vestments, lights, and incense. It cannot even be confined to the supreme achievement which takes place at the altar. I do not mean for one moment to suggest that anything other than the consecrated species is to be accepted, in this present world, as our Lord's Body; but I do say that what is there done, justifies not only the sacramental use of material things in worship, but demands a sacramental approach to the whole material world. And therefore it follows that to touch either money or machinery, food or furniture, or anything else, save for

the glory of God, is sacrilege. The selfish approach to material goods is sacrilege. The material ugliness and squalor which afflict so much of the modern world are condemned by Catholic philosophy, not primarily for artistic reasons, but for religious reasons. They result from mankind's wrong use of the world.

This seems to me to imply that our whole economic order, which works for material profit, is out of harmony with the Faith. I believe that devout Christians are increasingly feeling the contradiction between the Faith and our modern organization of life, and that is a good sign. I believe that the whole modern assumption that the world must be for ever the world, and the Church a beautifully sentimental institution for ever a thing apart, is on the eve of a great challenge. The return to a sacramental view of life will be a return to beauty, to decency, to honourable frugality. It will be the end of vulgar ostentation upon one hand, and of hideous squalor upon the other. It will mean bringing every material interest under the sway of spiritual reality.

Some time ago I heard a story about a deacon in a Welsh Calvinistic chapel, who was accused of pocketing part of the collection every Sunday. The deacons' meeting passed a resolution that he be asked, in future, to confine himself to the more spiritual side of the Church's work. That story is a rough illustration of what is the matter with the modern world. But the Catho-

lic religion will require that the use of money or machinery, food or clothing, shall be for God's glory, and for the performance of His will within the Society of His people.

(*b*) Again, the Catholic Faith is revolutionary in that it logically demands that the principle that governs the redeemed Society as a spiritual organism shall govern it throughout its whole extent. Now, what holds men together in the Church, is their fellowship in Christ ; their unselfish communion one with another and with all, in Him. And that same spiritual motive has to control all economic and industrial activity. Men have to work every day by the principle which governs them when they come to the altar. Loyalty to the Church must mean brotherhood amongst the Church's sons and daughters. The search for selfish gains, the pursuit of reward as the end of action, the loud assertion of rights, are hereby condemned. The Catholic religion has always aimed at world-dominion in the Name of Christ. It says that economics is a branch of theology. It claims to form civilization and control it—and this must surely mean that the opposition of classes, the ruthless strife of economic interests, is to be replaced by Christian co-operation. We cannot serve God and mammon. We cannot call men our brethren in church, and then fight them in the world with economic or military weapons. Life must be reduced to a single moral order. But how is it to be done ?

(*c*) Here we find that Catholicism is revolutionary in the method by which it must achieve its supremacy. I know the Church has tried other methods, but it has never found that they did it any good. We cannot force men into the redeemed Society, either by the sword or by coercive legislation. We can only show them the meaning of the redeemed Society; and then, if they hate it, we must be prepared to suffer, as Christ suffered. There is no other way. And the main task of Christians to-day is to build up that Catholic Society of Christ in such fullness and unity that it may be able to present the world with a clear issue.

Anglo-Catholicism believes that it has a great contribution to make to that end. It possesses the full Catholic tradition without the repressiveness and mechanical centralization of Rome. It possesses the open eye of freedom, without the sectarian weakness of Protestantism. If from Rome we can learn many lessons, at least we can teach not a few. And if within the British Commonwealth of nations we can uphold the true nature of the Catholic Society, we shall do our part toward overthrowing the materialism, the greed, and the jingoism which have cursed and darkened the modern world. We shall do our part for that great, divine city into which all the kings of the earth shall bring their glory and honour, and in whose light all nations shall walk. We shall operate to bring back beauty and brotherhood to our own

beloved land, that she may come again to the Holy Catholic Church, visibly one at last—and come, not with shame, but with rejoicing, bringing her sheaves with her.

For we are convinced that the only enduring and satisfying association of men must be within a Society based upon the eternal Triune Society of God; and of that Holy Society Christ, our Blessed Lord, is the revelation; and His embodiment in this world is that Church and Fellowship against which the gates of death shall not prevail.

II

CATHOLICISM AND THE SOUL

WE spoke in the last lecture of Catholicism and Society. We go on to consider the Catholic estimate of the soul, by which I really mean the interior life, the true value, and the ultimate destiny of the individual person. I am sure that whatever may be our denomination or ecclesiastical colour, if we call ourselves Christians we shall agree that any system which aims at saving society must admit the essential need for good men and women, strong, intelligent, and brave. And we shall declare with one voice that whatever diminishes a man's spiritual significance, whatever tends to reduce our notion of personality, is so far evil and bound to produce bad fruit.

Now, I am well aware that upon this ground Catholicism, in certain quarters, is suspect. It has to meet definite charges which are reinforced by certain historical instances. There is a widespread assumption that whatever advantages Catholicism may have to offer, they can be gained only by the surrender of personal liberty, both of thought and of action; and that

neither political nor religious freedom is possible within the Catholic system.

When people hear that a priest of the English Church claims to be a Catholic, follows Catholic practice, teaches the Catholic Faith, and yet holds what are called 'advanced' opinions about political and economic questions, shakes hands with Nonconformists, and never tries to frighten any one into his Church, they are apt to suppose that this particular priest is a decent man at heart, but that his head is a little weak. 'His religion and his practice,' they say, 'do not tally.' 'He is a good man, in spite of his dark and narrow creed'—and so on. If he were a consistent Catholic, he would, of course, sympathize with the methods of Bloody Mary and Torquemada! These people do not stop to ask the very simple question, whether it is quite certain that the right application of Catholic principles was made by those distinguished historical personages, or is now being made by the humble parish priest. It may be that the latter, after all, is the better Catholic.

At any rate, nobody can question three assertions that I am now going to make about Catholic theology: assertions which have a most important bearing upon the doctrine of personality. Whatever the Catholic Church may or may not have done at any particular period: whatever individual Catholics may have said or written, it is undeniable that the Church is committed to certain dogmas about

man which involve the utmost respect for the individual, and the profoundest conception of the meaning and value of personality :

First of all, Catholicism holds that man is a spiritual creation, of a nature akin to the divine. It has never had any traffic with theories which maintain a purely natural origin of human life. It does not deny the doctrine of evolution, but it will never allow that the difference between a man and a worm is one only of degree. Nor will it agree with some modern psychologists, and admit that the whole endeavour of the soul is rightly concerned with the satisfaction of natural desires. Its dogma asserts that the origin and meaning of the soul are to be found in the supernatural.

Secondly, Catholic teaching has always defended the reality and validity of personal moral action. It asserts the freedom of the will: it declares for the real goodness or badness of human deeds. It will not allow that man is the product of natural forces which he cannot control, or the subject of a divine decree which he cannot undo. It will have neither the Calvinist nor the determinist. One of the great Catholic doctors, S. Augustine, seems at times to approach the position of Calvin; but that is because he inclines to over-emphasize his reply to a certain heresy which we shall notice in a moment. The main teaching of Catholicism has certainly upheld the reality of moral action: the validity of choice. Thus it is bound to

respect every human soul as a soul, because it regards every soul as individually concerned with its own destiny.

Thirdly, Catholicism involves a doctrine of human equality. Not, of course, that it supposes that all men are equal in their powers, any more than in physical size and strength. But it declares two great grounds of equality. The first is, that no man is really necessary to God—and God has no more need of the greatest human genius than He has of the rudest country bumpkin. Catholic theology has always been clear and definite in its doctrine of creation. God did not create either the universe or mankind because He needed anything. Nothing is needed to complete His eternal self-sufficiency. He created out of the fullness of that sufficiency, out of the fullness of His love and grace. Consequently, in the absolute sense, we are all one before God, since we are all utterly in debt to Him.

But again, we have all misused our gifts. We are all sinners, and not one of us can save himself. Centuries ago the Catholic Church had to settle this question with Pelagius, who gave too much credit to the work of man's will in the saving of his soul. This, of course, is where S. Augustine comes in. The Church asserts that man cannot save himself. And this is the great defence against Pharisaism, against spiritual pride and self-esteem. Popes, emperors, saints, slaves, pick-pockets, and profiteers, all

alike are dependent upon the grace of God. And this prevents any such moral distinction between classes as was conceived by Plato and Aristotle. It makes any social rank of secondary consideration. It upholds the humblest as being ultimately upon the same level of consideration as the highest, and teaches that 'a man 's a man for a' that.'

I say that it is undeniable that Catholicism is committed to this view of man, and it is a very definite view about every man. Of course, it is quite easy to show that the Church has not always lived up to this view: has frequently drawn wrong conclusions from it. I think it could be shown that neither the Roman nor the Anglican Church has always drawn the right conclusions—and I think that Anglo-Catholicism to-day is more ready to do so than is the Roman Church, though that great Church must be honoured for the tenacity with which she has held to the lofty and liberating dogma of the soul through the long centuries. And whatever may be said about the practice of the Church in any age, it ought to be thoroughly understood that these are its principles. Concerning some points in its practice we shall say a word or two later on. We must notice, however, that certain direct criticisms and charges are made, not merely against the misdeeds of the Church in bygone times, or at the present day, but against the whole Catholic idea of religion, as being neglectful of, or deliberately

antagonistic toward, individual and personal values.

1. It is said that the very strength of Catholicism in outward organization, its very insistence upon corporate life, tends to reduce its conception of the importance of the individual soul.

(*a*) That this is seen in its doctrine of Sacraments, which makes religion mechanical and impersonal.

(*b*) Also, that its employment of visible means in devotion depresses the vigour of inward spiritual life.

2. Again, it is said that Catholicism is bound to be repressive and intolerant of individual freedom and initiative.

(*a*) Its conception of priesthood debars the soul of the ordinary man from access to God.

(*b*) Its conception of authority has compelled it to persecute those who have ventured to teach in opposition to the Church.

Let us examine these charges in order. And let me say candidly that there is scarcely one of them for which some sort of evidence cannot be found. But this is not to say that we must admit the charges. It means only that the Catholic principle has sometimes been perverted in practice, just as all great principles have been. If it can be shown that the only possible application of a principle is one which is damaging to the religious life of mankind, then we must reconsider our allegiance to that principle. But if no more can be proved than

that some men, at some periods, have misapplied that principle, then we are justified in adhering to it until it is shown, upon other grounds, to be false or inadequate.

And indeed, if we venture to attack some of our critics, and ask, for instance, what has happened at times with the Protestant principle of the right of private judgement, and call to memory the crack-brained lunacies which have propagated themselves upon that principle; or if we consider to what wild extremes the doctrine of personal experience has been carried; or if we remember what some fanatics have made of the Protestant doctrine of the authority of the Bible, we may conclude that the Reformation was utterly a mistake and a disastrous work of the devil. And that, I think, would be a conclusion far too sweeping. We come, then, to the charges against the Catholic idea, the Catholic philosophy.

1. To say that a great concern for corporate life, for the organization of society, must necessarily mean a lack of concern for the individual, is a totally false antithesis. It is the judgement of a one-eyed criticism. Let us understand, once and for all, that man is intended to be thoroughly personal and thoroughly social, and both things at the same time. You cannot care for personality unless you care for society. You cannot care for society unless you care for personality. To say that if you do one thing you cannot do the other is quite false—and

that very opinion has recently been described as a sure sign of a shallow mind. Therefore it is idle to say that Catholicism cannot be concerned for the individual soul because it is concerned for the Church. It cannot rightly approach the soul unless it is concerned for the Church.

(*a*) It follows, therefore, that a doctrine of Sacraments has not necessarily anything to do with mechanical and impersonal notions. A Sacrament is a function of the redeemed Society, which consists of persons. The Lord is a Person: a priest is a person: the people are persons. Indeed, a Sacrament is the true control of material things for truly personal ends. But the Sacrament is objective and sure, because the Society is one, continuous, and permanent, and is independent of the fluctuating moods and feelings of its individual members. Catholic teaching says that a Sacrament is a Sacrament, even though administered by a bad priest. That is not a mechanical notion. It means that a priest's private life cannot destroy a Sacrament, because it does not make a Sacrament. It is not his to give. It is the gift of Christ through the whole Church. But a priest's private life may affect the mind and the faith of communicants, so that they come irreverently or frivolously to the altar. And while they still receive a Sacrament, the state of their souls prevents their receiving its true fruits and blessings.

That is Catholic teaching. It is, in fact, the

teaching of S. Paul. The Church's functions and gifts remain, apart from the whims and the failures of individuals; but it is for the individual to make sure that he receives the benefit of those functions and gifts. To suppose that a society's operation derives only from the changeful tempers and inconstant loyalty of individuals would make it impossible to conceive the existence of society. England is still England, though large numbers of men may be very disgruntled about their income-tax.

(*b*) As for the opinion that the employment of visible means must inevitably tend to depress the importance of inward reality, I think no suggestion could be more wide of the mark. One of the most vivid, inward experiences of a man's life results in a wedding ring, and is to be suspected if it shows no signs of producing that result. The completely false psychology which separates between spiritual expression and the employment of material means, is almost too foolish to discuss. The Quaker does not abandon material, visible, and outward means, when he employs a very plain meeting house, and silence. He has positively to make these things for himself, because God's world is filled with colour and noise, and the Quaker has to make out of that world a very specialized and highly symbolic adaptation. And certainly he does not abandon material means when he goes with his food and medicine to relieve the suffering peoples of the earth.

Of course, there is a danger that small souls will regard the material means as ends in themselves : will become so closely engaged about altar frontals, processional crosses, and what not, that they forget the issues of life. And other small souls will have equal concern to abolish altar frontals and processional crosses. And many indeed will imagine that food and medicine are ends in themselves. The fact remains, however, that we live embodied lives. Body and soul are related in closest immediacy. And the body is surely intended to minister to the soul in worship, as in everything else. If you see a person kissing a crucifix, you have as much right to suspect his inward religious experience, as you would have to suspect a man's love for his mother, because you came upon him kissing her photograph.

2. Again, it is said that Catholicism, by its very nature, is bound to be repressive and intolerant of individual freedom and initiative.

(*a*) First, because of its conception of priesthood, which debars the soul from God, and places a sacerdotal caste as intermediary between a man and his Maker.

Such conceptions of priesthood exist in the world, and no doubt from time to time, and in particular places, they may have invaded the Church. But the Catholic notion of priesthood is nothing of the sort. We have to remember that priesthood is obviously a genuine expression of man's religious need, and that our Lord

never claimed to abolish the institution. The New Testament indicates that the Church is a priestly body; and a society is bound to perform its characteristic acts, by means of appointed persons to whom a definite and responsible status is given. The priest is the representative of Christ and His Church; but his work is never to keep God and man apart, but to bring them together. And what he does in a particular sense, the whole Church does in a general sense. For any man to deny that he needs the assistance of the Church to bring him to God is mere philistinism and self-glory. We depend upon society to bring us to civilization: we depend upon the redeemed Society to bring us to the Christian life.

From the point of view of ministering to others, it is impossible to set up any person as a Christian minister without requiring him to perform, regularly or irregularly, some priestly function. I discovered this through years of Nonconformist experience. Perhaps the most distinctly dangerous sacerdotal function that can be discharged anywhere is the extempore prayer, offered by one man out of his own limited range of life, out of his own shifting moods, and in his own phraseology, week by week and year by year, before a congregation. Priesthood is much safer and healthier when it is the accepted expression of the common devotional life of a society. Its full recognition does not make a man proud, but humble. It

impresses him with the fact of his servitude. A preacher is always in danger of considering himself primarily as an artist. A Christian priest is never to be excused for forgetting that he is the minister of souls.

(*b*) Finally, it is said that the Catholic conception of authority compels the persecution of those who teach in opposition to the Church. And certainly nobody can deny that such persecution has occurred. But again I deny that persecution arises out of a conception of authority which can rightly be called Catholic. The Church during several centuries, so far from persecuting, was persecuted: and quite a long time passed, even after the Church had become the leader of Europe, before it persecuted any one.

How and why it came to persecute can be very simply explained. A twofold assumption had been made: First, that practically the whole of Europe was Christian, and that this society was the Church, and the Church was this society. Secondly, that the supreme control of this society was vested in the Bishop of Rome. It was an age in which men were not over-squeamish about physical suffering. In some respects we should call it brutal, though it had virtues which we lack. Now, opposition to the Church was viewed as opposition to society: a heretic was a traitor. But heresy, by that time, meant whatever happened to be disapproved by the Papal authority: and being

in opposition to the Pope was the same thing, theoretically, as being in opposition to Christendom. Do not imagine that I am defending persecution ; I am only trying to explain it. I consider it both loathsome and futile. But let us not forget that if the authority in the Catholic Society persecuted those who broke away from it, the national and secular societies persecuted Catholics with at least equal vigour and cruelty.

It is, however, absurd to suppose that such methods are intrinsic to Catholicism. We Anglo-Catholics, following an older and wiser Catholic tradition, are not committed to the belief that the Church's authority is centred and confined in one autocratic bishop. We desire to see authority more broadly based, and exercised by such means as accord with the mind of Christ. We do desire to see one Holy Catholic Church, including all Christian men. But we know we cannot force men into it, or keep them in it by persecution. I think Rome herself has learned this lesson, though I think she has not formally renounced persecution as a means. But let us be quite clear. Catholicism does not mean a higgledy-piggledy mob of people believing and practising all sorts of things or nothing in particular. We believe in converting the world to the Catholic Faith, and we do not wish to include anybody until he is converted. The notion that you can have a Church without some kind of creed is folly.

Dr. Johnson once told a Presbyterian minister who wanted no creeds at all that he was 'a bigot to laxity.' Obviously, you cannot hold men in universal association without some principle capable of being expressed, even though the expression may never be fully adequate. Such expression is a creed. But we do not think you can ever force a man to be a Christian. You can only say, 'If you don't like the Church, you must wait outside until you do. Meanwhile we shall do our best to win your love.'

Of course, we cannot restore a Christian civilization until the great majority of men accept the Church's authority in life. The Church at the close of the Middle Ages had made the twofold mistake, firstly of substituting the authority of one bishop for the authority of the Church (of which the Pope is rightly the first minister); and secondly of attempting to secure the cohesion of the assumed Christian Society by secular methods. But I do not know that it is for the present age to find much fault with her. The Bolshevists have repressed all people in Russia who differed from their conception of society. Mussolini has repressed all the people in Italy who differ from his conception of society. And Sir W. Joynson-Hicks seems very eager to repress all the people in England who differ from his conception of society. The Church was only doing the same thing, in an age of enormous problems, by methods generally accepted in that age. I think the

whole object is silly and the means employed are ultimately useless. No Anglo-Catholic would for one moment admit that men can ever be won, or kept in the Church, by any other means than those of love and light.

We should maintain that this is a consistent application of the Catholic Faith. For, indeed, so far from the truth are these charges against the Catholic conception of religion, that it will be easy to show, by a series of various considerations, that Catholicism does actually emphasize the importance of personal values, of personal religious life, and of personal conviction. Let us not forget that it was Ezekiel, the greatest and most 'ritualistic' of Old Testament Churchmen, who laid most stress upon personal responsibility.

a. The mediaeval schoolmen taught that personality was an end. Both John of Salisbury and S. Thomas Aquinas taught that the Christian Society was properly founded upon the communion of its members with God, and that in and through this communion with God they came into fellowship with each other. Such was the authoritative interpretation of the Christian Republic. The Pope and the clergy, the emperor, with all kings and counsellors, were the ministers of this Society; but its life was drawn from the union of each man with God. And that was held and taught by great Catholic doctors.

b. Up to the time of the Reformation the

Church had shown no marked disposition to thwart and stifle intellectual energy and inquiry. The clergy encouraged the Renaissance which came from Greece. They were not opposed to experimental science. They were the chief patrons of the new art of printing, and of the first books printed and widely circulated in Europe the largest number were works of Catholic devotion or of Catholic theology. The person who made the maps which led Columbus to the new world was an eminent ecclesiastic. There was at that time quite a wide margin of theological freedom—indeed, the pre-Reformation Catholic Church was not unlike the Church of England of to-day in that respect, specially as regards its bishops! There was little of that resolute rejection of all new thought which afterwards seemed to characterize the Church in the eyes of many honest thinkers.[1]

c. When we come to the actual government of the Church, we find that the Church was most distinctly Catholic in doctrine and practice, long before it was Papal in anything like the modern sense of that word. We find that in earlier days the election of a bishop was as popular and democratic, and often as exciting, as any modern parliamentary election. And for my own part, I do not think the Church of England will be less Catholic when the appoint-

[1] The atmosphere of the Reformation period was, of course, very different. But the Protestant leaders denounced the new science with great vigour.

ment of her bishops is given, in some sane manner, into the hands of her own people.

d. In the very Sacraments of the Church, the place and function of the individual person was, and is, admitted. I have already noted that the Church teaches that the benefit of the Sacrament depends upon the right disposition of the communicant. But further, the Roman Missal itself requires the priest to turn toward the people and to describe the Mass as ' this my sacrifice and yours '—whereas no preacher in a pulpit could possibly describe his sermon as ' this my sermon and yours '; and if he were to do so, probably a good many of his hearers would object. And yet again, the Church does not admit to Communion until a person has been confirmed, or is desirous of being confirmed: which once more throws a weight of personal choice and decision upon each one.

e. Further, we must bear in mind that Catholicism, as seen in her saints, produces as its choicest fruit, not one type, but many, various types. This is proof that the Catholic system does not crush out individuality. Can Protestantism show such variety and diversity of temper, outlook, and accomplishment as is represented by S. Augustine and S. Ambrose ; S. Francis and S. Dominic; S. Ignatius Loyola and S. Theresa ; S. Thomas Aquinas and S. Catharine ? And if we are to speak of inward religion, and profound personal experience, then we may point out that Catholicism

has given a special place to the contemplative—a thing that Protestantism has never done. Catholicism says that some men and women are definitely called to devote the whole of their lives to prayer. And if you go to a Carthusian monastery, you will find that their devotions may be practised in a surprisingly individual manner.

f. In addition to all this, we may hear the actual testimonies of the Catholic saints. I will here confine myself to those whom the Roman Church has accepted as her noblest and most faithful children, and whose religious attitude is therefore certainly approved by her. Let us remember the cry of S. Augustine, 'O Lord, teach me to know Thee and to know myself.' Or of S. Francis of Assisi, 'Who art Thou, Lord, and who am I?'—words which sound the very depths of religious consciousness, depths which are similarly touched in Wesley's hymn, 'Come, O Thou Traveller unknown.' And is this not an indication of a religion sufficiently 'personal'?

I suppose the most searching and indeed terrible book ever written upon the subject of self-examination is the *Spiritual Exercises* of S. Ignatius Loyola. Listen to some of his directions to the person who is to examine his own soul before God. He tells him to ask himself:

How long is it since you committed mortal sin the first time?

Why did not God strike you dead after this first sin ?

Why has God spared you until now ?

What was there in you to inspire God with so much mercy toward you ? If He considers the past . . . ? If He should consider the present . . . ? And yet God has left you with life, and with life grace to return to Him and to repent.

S. Ignatius goes on to speak of the results of sin in the most awful ways. Then he turns to the humility, the poverty, and the sufferings of Christ, contrasting our Lord with men. He calls the soul to give itself to God entirely, and speaks of the blessings of this action—a superabundance of graces, peace of heart, the unction of the Holy Ghost, and the moral assurance of salvation. And throughout these Exercises there occurs his prayer, the *Anima Christi :*

Soul of Christ, sanctify me.
Body of Christ, save me.
Blood of Christ, inebriate me.
Water out of the side of Christ, wash me.
Passion of Christ, strengthen me.
O good Jesus, hear me ;
Hide me within Thy wounds ;
Suffer me not to be separated from Thee ;
Defend me from the malignant enemy ;
Call me at the hour of my death,
And bid me come unto Thee,
That with Thy saints I may praise Thee
For all eternity.

Can any one suggest that this is not personal

religion ? You may not like some of its phrases and figures, but the intensity of concern for the individual soul is here surely apparent.

Or if we would speak of the indwelling of Christ in the soul, let us go to S. Theresa. In her book, *The Way of Perfection*, you will find this passage :

> ' Let us realize [she says] that we have within us a most splendid palace built entirely of gold and precious stones—in short, one that is fit for so great a Lord—and that we are partly responsible for the condition of this building, because there is no structure so beautiful as a soul filled with virtues, and the more perfect these virtues are the more brilliantly do the jewels shine. Within this palace dwells the mighty King Who has deigned to become your Father, and Who is seated on a throne of priceless value—by which I mean your heart.'

Was the soul of that wise, good woman a stranger to interior communion with God ? Or was she negligent of the importance of this for all believers ?

Or remember again the directions given by S. Francis de Sales to his converts—questions they were to ask themselves: ' What is the state of your heart as regards God Himself ? ' ' Does it delight in remembering Him ? ' ' If amidst the occupations or vanities of the world the remembrance of God comes over you, does it find room in your heart ? ' ' What is the state of your heart as regards Jesus Christ, both God and man ? Do you delight in being near to Him ? ' One could multiply such evidence indefinitely. Think of some of the hymns written

by Catholics — 'Jesu, the very thought of Thee with sweetness fills my breast,' and a hundred more to which we turn to express our most ardent personal devotion to our Lord.

And when we go back to the origins of the Catholic revival in the English Church, and think of men like Newman, Keble, Pusey, and Isaac Williams, we are thinking of men whose lives had the savour of saintliness. When we pass on we find men like Father Dolling and Father Stanton. And can any one suppose that the present leaders of Anglo-Catholicism have anything but the warmest, most eager desire to see men really loving Christ, knowing Him as their present Saviour, and rejoicing in His abiding presence in their hearts? The Bishop of Manchester, who speaks perhaps from a somewhat detached, though not hostile, standpoint, has declared publicly that he believes the Anglo-Catholic movement to be a revival of religion; and when Dr. Temple speaks of religion, he means a power that will move a man's heart and mind and will.

All this is sufficient, surely, to prove that Catholicism includes an enormous emphasis upon interior life and personal values—and this, in spite of admitted faults and failings during the long centuries. Sometimes the individual soul has been neglected: then the Church was false to her Catholic Faith. Sometimes the individual has been placed under the arbitrary power of the priest. That was un-Catholic.

Sometimes there has been imported into religious devotions some exaggeration—as in the kind, and the proportion, of devotions to our Lady permitted in the modern Roman Church. And that is un-Catholic. All this we may admit. But we are speaking of the Catholic conception as a whole, and as an ideal which has found wonderful embodiment over long periods of time and in many lands, and it cannot be truthfully alleged that the nature of Catholicism involves any neglect of personality or any stifling of individual life.

We may now go on to point out that Catholicism certainly attempts to do more for the training of the individual soul than any other form of Christianity does. It so regards the soul as belonging to the Society, that it considers it necessary, not only that the soul should be loyal to the Society, but that the Society should be loyal to the soul. This is the underlying meaning of infant Baptism, and of that care for the religious instruction of children which seems to be a Catholic instinct, and is one of the special glories of the Roman Church. It also accounts for the many provisions which Catholicism makes for the cultivation of the inner life of the adult. I know that to many outsiders this seems to be simply a means of destroying the individual's private judgement, warping his tastes, and moulding him by external influences into a particular mental and moral shape: and some people are filled with a fury

of resentment against such an operation. If there are any such present, I would ask them to pause and consider a few points.

First, that as a matter of fact, as we saw a moment since, the Catholic saints are not all of one shape or size. When Catholicism becomes a kind of rigid drill, it is at its weakest as a religious force. I think modern Romanism is in some danger in this respect. But at all events, even if the individualist's account of the matter were true, the Church could not be accused of doing for itself more than the modern State does for itself. How did pre-war Germany deal with the children in its schools? How does Bolshevist Russia deal with its children? How does Mussolini deal with all Italians through the Press? How did the British authorities deal with us, through the Publicity Department, during the war? And apart from any extreme instances, is it not a fact that normally the State seeks to educate its citizens in loyalty to itself, upon the assumption that, for them, this State is the supreme society? Now, I do not believe that about any State; but I do believe it about the Church, because I believe the Church was founded by Christ and is governed by His Spirit. Therefore, I am justified in holding that the Church has the duty of educating its people.

Of course, if any one denies that the Church is the supreme Society and is of divine origin, we must repeat the arguments we used in the

previous lecture in defence of our belief. But, there is an enormous difference between the operation of the State upon the individual and the operation of the Church upon the soul. The State is content to produce conformity and loyalty toward itself as a visible society. The Church cannot rightly be content until it has brought the soul into conscious communion with the ground and principle of the whole divine Society—that is, with our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. And there are great historical instances to show that when the soul thus brought to Christ is wishful to persevere in the fellowship of the Church, scope may be found for individual initiative both in thought and action. The Roman Church gave such scope to S. Francis. The English Church does it to-day most freely—though perhaps it would have been better for us all had the English Church given fuller sympathy, in days gone by, both to Wesley and to Newman.

I think the Catholic genius does display itself in the provision it makes for the needs of the individual soul. While it expresses itself in more distinctive acts of corporate worship than Protestantism does, it deals more thoroughly, more particularly, and more systematically with each heart that is willing to accept its guidance. It does this, for instance, in the Sacrament of Confession. And let every one get out of his head the supposition that when a Catholic goes to confess his sins, he is making confession

to an individual, a man, Mr. Jones or Mr. Robinson. He is doing nothing of the sort. He is going to the Society of God, through its accredited representative. The priest will never use the knowledge he gains in the confessional for any other purpose than for the future guidance of that soul. He may not repeat to another mortal person what he hears. Nor will he claim to 'forgive'—as though he were the fount of forgiveness. All he does is what he is bound to do—to grant absolution to any one who confesses and repents in such a manner that his sincerity cannot be doubted.

But you say, Why cannot I go straight to God? Well, of course, you can. There is nothing on earth to prevent you. By all means go straight to God. But remember that if you belong to the Church, you are a member of God's Society; and God has undertaken to deal with you, not only as a solitary individual, but as a member of that Society.[1] Within that fellowship you learned the Faith, you receive the Sacraments, you hear the Word. Is it quite absurd that within the same fellowship of brethren you should confess your failures and shortcomings, remembering that by your sins you have dishonoured the Church, and spoiled its fellowship? If you really feel that you ought not to confess to a priest, then you ought at least

[1] One great value of sacramental confession is of course that it corrects the subjectivism of the person who 'goes to God'—but whose 'God' is ultimately no more than himself.

to stand up in Church and tell the Church publicly about your sins—perhaps you would like that better! That practice, however, was abandoned at an early date. The Methodists made some revival of it in their class-meetings; but class-meetings are not in a healthy state as a means of confession nowadays.

Upon the whole it is undoubtedly best that confession should be made through the medium of the appointed ministers of the Church; and that from a priest, who has had real training for the purpose, people should seek guidance in their spiritual problems. But even if you say this is all wrong, you cannot deny that it shows a great concern for the soul. And where confession is allowed to be voluntary, and not imposed as an invariable condition, you have also the greatest evidence of respect for the individual's own judgement.

Beyond this, Catholicism, by the provision it makes for frequent Communion throughout the week, and by opening churches for prayer and meditation, encourages the life of ardent devotion. I myself would be prepared to defend the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for this purpose, and here I would speak, if there were time, of my own personal experience. But I must content myself with adding that the Catholic religion teaches people to pray in their own homes, to be regular and persevering in their private devotions when there is neither priest nor altar present. It does this with emphasis.

In face of these facts, the assertion that Catholicism is impersonal, neglectful of interior spiritual life, or necessarily repressive of personal development is absurd. Many of the world's most gigantic and creative personalities have been faithful Catholics: and possibly most of the world's holy men and women have been Catholics. Not that I hold that Catholics as a whole have sufficient personal religion. Who has ? But I am sure that if they are true to the Church and the Faith, they can have and ought to have a conscious walk with God.

Catholicism, indeed, is bound to place a great value upon the soul, because of its unwavering testimony to the soul's nature and destiny. Its transcendent estimate of the human person makes it certain that wherever the Church has consented to impersonal and mechanical formalism, wherever it has discouraged or neglected evangelical experience, it has been false to the spiritual logic of Catholicism. The Catholic Faith holds that a man walks along the strange, pathetic roads of this earth to a goal which is invisible, and that this invisible goal determines the significance of his present labour—may make the pride and purple of an emperor a mockery: may make the hard and humble toil of a peasant sublime. And thus, when the Catholic Church has most boldly and clearly enunciated the Faith, it has always sought to apply the Gospel of Christ to the situation of man in the world of economics and politics,

protecting personality from the blind pressure of secular systems. And it is because I believe that I have discerned in the movement of Catholicism in the English Church, more boldly sounded than elsewhere, the clear notes of this trumpet of battle against all that oppresses the souls of men in England to-day, that I have found it not only easy, but joyous, to serve under that banner.

But the care of Catholicism for a man does not cease when he passes from the fellowship of the Church militant here on earth. While he lies sick, the priest speaks his name at the altar. And when he is dead, his name is still spoken and prayer is offered for him. The Faith will not allow that the rude hand of death has broken the spiritual ties which bound him to his brethren in Christ who are left behind. The Church will continue to offer its gifts for him, before the throne of God, knowing well that wayfaring men need the assistance of all their brethren, before they come to the beatific vision.

I cannot understand the dislike of any Christian man or woman for prayers for the dead. People say the dead are now in the hands of God. But are we not all in the hands of God? Or they say that our knowledge of the unseen life is so small that we can never pray for the departed without hesitancy and uncertainty. But our knowledge of that life is sufficient to assure us that men who are imper-

fect go into the unseen, that their only true goal is unimpeded communion with God and His saints, that for this they need God's blessed grace; and that God's grace is vouchsafed in answer to prayer. The only ground upon which prayer for the dead can be rejected is that the soul's eternal destiny is somehow settled at the moment of death—and that is false to Christian feeling, has no real warrant in Scripture, and is out of touch with a sense of reality. Catholicism declares that even after death a person is still a person; and, moreover, that being still a person he is still within that great fellowship of the Redeemed, of which the Church on earth is a true, integral, and creative part.

If we are to see in the world a restoration of balance between the soul and society, between individual and corporate life, we must look to the restoration of the Catholic Church as the home of men, the mother of men, the leader of men: the Catholic Church, delivered from the bondage of historic mistakes, filled with new generosity, replete with human sympathy, quick to understand and praise all that is true in human thought, all that is noble in the aspirations of our age, eager to welcome and reinforce every humane and enlightening movement in the modern world. It is peculiarly the function of Anglo-Catholicism to lead in this endeavour. But at the same time, the Catholic Church will stand upon her eternal foundation, and in allegiance to her own true

history she will hold for ever that neither man nor nation is of final meaning or value, except in the light of that other world which shone upon us when the Bright and Morning Star appeared, and Christ was born in Bethlehem.

III

CATHOLICISM AND THE WORLD'S FUTURE

IT is yet far too early to attempt any estimate of the main results of the Great War upon the life and outlook of mankind. We who lived through it are too near to its events to measure their true proportions; and, indeed, it may be said that its effects are not yet complete. We cannot judge whether, in a hundred year's time, historians will conclude that the Great War, as we call it, was of deeper significance than the upheaval of the Napoleonic era. And its ultimate importance may be dwarfed by changes of unprecedented character during the next few generations. But there is, I think, one subtle and revealing change which has been wrought by our experiences, a change which has affected the moral and political atmosphere, and has moved the minds of journalists and theologians alike. It can be described in a few words.

In the year 1869 Matthew Arnold published his book, *Culture and Anarchy*, and if any one wishes to understand the fundamental difference between the pre-war and post-war outlook,

I recommend him to read that book. Not that Matthew Arnold shared the assumptions of his time. He most emphatically did not. He protested against those assumptions. He found men, on all sides, assuming two things : That human progress was an assured process, attained by the operation of indefeasible forces ; and that this progress was measurable in terms of material wealth and mechanical contrivance. But his protest fell upon deaf ears.

Apart from a small set-back of artistic and literary pessimism in the eighteen-nineties, the conviction gathered strength that mankind was regularly evolving according to the evolutionary laws of that 'nature' which had produced it. Man's knowledge of the world was advancing by rapid strides. His power to control and exploit nature had reached unexampled achievements. The material conditions of life were being overhauled and changed in a most marvellous manner. And for the moralist and idealist there were features of the situation which seemed to afford not a little satisfaction. There had been, at the beginning of this present century, a whole generation of peace between the great powers of Europe. True, that period was one of widespread colonial warfare; but as this was said to be necessary in order that the light of modern civilization might shine in dark corners of the earth, it did not appear to prove that there was any uncertainty about the general human advance. It

is also true that in this period the powers of Europe were arming themselves as never hitherto ; but as they all declared that they were doing this in order to preserve peace on earth and goodwill amongst men, this also seemed a small matter. Again, the movement of democratic and reforming legislation, in several countries, seemed to open vistas of freedom broadening down ' from precedent to precedent.' And so, from various considerations, men were apt to conclude that man was making fast for the kingdom of God, or at least, for the kingdom of this world—which seemed, at that time, pretty much the same thing.

We must not fail to notice, however, that this whole period was one of decline in religion. Of course, it was marked by more than one important religious movement, but speaking broadly and generally we must say that religion had been removed from its position of central and supreme importance. This had been going on for a few centuries; but at the beginning of the present century it was widely assumed that the definite work of religion was finished, and that the human race could now be trusted to behave itself without any reference to supernatural issues. Thus, somewhere about the year 1910, an eminent minister of the Gospel told me that he was not in the least concerned about declining church attendance, because he felt that the whole world was rapidly becoming the kingdom of God. Apparently he supposed that an out-

standing feature of the kingdom of God would be a total absence of any desire to worship God! And a little later I met a gentleman who believed himself to be a politician; and he assured me that it was possible to do for men by political legislation all that religion had ever promised to do. He added that the Church was now nothing more than a museum.

Indeed, both from thinkers and writers, and from young men in clubs and classes, I gathered the same thing : The secular success of mankind was positively assured; and the assumption was that this was the only thing that mattered.

People seemed to have forgotten John Stuart Mill. He had shared all these anticipations long before; but he had eventually confessed that a mood of deep depression had descended upon him when he realized that all these secular hopes were quite capable of being achieved. What he had then seen, however darkly, was the ancient truth that if this be the whole destiny of mankind, then it is a destiny ridiculously inadequate.

Now, I think there can be no doubt that this attitude of cocksureness has been seriously shaken. One has only to listen to the speeches of our publicists, or to read the leading articles in the newspapers, to appreciate the change. It is not merely that we are uncertain about the immediate future of Europe, or worried about the world's confusion in this generation. I

think the change is something deeper than that. It is not only that we are conscious of having received a nasty jar upon the ever upward road of our evolution. What has come, in silent and subtle fashion, upon reflective minds, is the perception that if so terrible a set-back could befall the world in 1914, amidst all its material achievements and prosperity, there is no essential reason, in the nature of things, why an even more serious set-back should not occur in a future generation; and, seeing how great were the perils to civilization which arose in our time, it is at least conceivable that the civilization which we have known may yet generate the forces which will accomplish its own destruction. In other words, it is no longer so easily assumed that progress is assured, or that it can be measured in mechanical and material terms.

Indeed, this mood of uncertainty will be found engaged with questions even more precise and fundamental. If human progress be not assured, if it be not a predetermined and indefeasible process, what does this imply? Does it mean that the total collapse of our race, and its final disappearance, would make no vital difference to the universe? Does it mean that there may or may not be a happy issue of the human story, but that whether this be so or not is totally unknown to any mind, human or superhuman? Or does it mean that while progress is not assured, apart from certain conditions which man himself must fulfil, yet,

if he fulfil those conditions, there is an active Providence which will complete his work and carry our human species to a splendid goal? It is at once obvious that if we are going to give up the notion of progress as irrevocably determined by natural law—a notion which may mean that whatever happens on Friday is better than what happens on Thursday—then the only hopeful alternative is the last named: that in the ordering of this world, the welfare and triumph of humanity are intended; but they are intended only as the result of man's fulfilment of certain conditions.

Although the superstition of a mechanical progress has exercised an enormous influence in some ways, there is a sense in which it has won no practical acceptance. For, if men were to accept it in practice, they would be content to sit down and play dominoes until the Golden Age automatically arrived. As a matter of fact, they have really assumed that progress did depend upon the fulfilment of certain conditions; but they have been mistaken about the conditions. The great modern assumption has been that progress depends upon adaptation to environment—which may be right enough, if only you have made no mistake as to what the environment is. Where the modern world has gone wrong is in supposing that the total environment of man, for all practical purposes, is to be found in this visible world. Mankind has been striving with furious energy to adapt

itself to that, and to that alone. It was against this foreshortening of the human vision that Matthew Arnold protested. It was the results of this foreshortening that were so searchingly analysed, just before the war, by Professor Rudolf Eucken, in several important works. And since then the results have accumulated.

The great glory of this secularism has been its 'modernity.' There grew up a somewhat crude and vulgar assumption of superiority over all other ages. The modern world was supposed to be one vast improvement upon everything that had gone before, and if any one doubted this, he was promptly labelled 'pessimist.' Upon this point we may well pause to make a reflection. It seems to me only right to suppose that if man's life were rationally, morally, and spiritually unimpaired, there would be real progress in this world. I am not one of those people who scoff at the idea of change. I believe one or two simple and elementary things. I believe that while man was not sent into the world completely equipped with full knowledge and experience, he certainly was endowed with an inquiring turn of mind. Further, I believe that when a man has discovered something which nobody knew before, he can transmit this knowledge to his children. And I can conceive the accumulation of knowledge and the consequent improvement of practice increasing down the ages.

The Catholic Church does not deny this.

No Catholic need be afraid of this idea of progress. Any Catholic anxious to reach a given destination in the shortest time, would prefer a Rolls-Royce car to a donkey-cart; but even a donkey-cart represents a stage of progress. But the 'modernity' of the modern period did not consist in any mere approval of change. The difference between the modern and the mediaeval periods, for example, was something more profound. It was not a difference like that between black and white: it was a matter of proportion and emphasis; but there can be no doubt that the real core and principle of 'modernity' has been a preoccupation with the sensible world: an assumption that the sole pathway to real knowledge was by observational science: that the supreme reality was that which reached our minds directly through the senses: and that the success of the human race must be judged by its power to adjust itself to this world, or so to alter this world as to provide economic satisfaction and material sufficiency. The governing motive of human association was taken to be the economic motive, and morality was interpreted as the minister of a society whose ends were entirely circumscribed by earthly horizons.

This movement can be traced from the beginnings of our modern period, in many spheres of thought. It is significant that whereas Copernicus, whose name stands for a tremendous scientific revolution, dedicated his book,

On the Revolutions of the Celestial Orbs, to the Pope, and was never touched by the Church, though, indeed, his great work did not see the light until after his death; yet Giordano Bruno, who attempted to work out the Copernican principles, was burned for his pains. But between Copernicus and Bruno there is a vast difference. Bruno denied particular providence, rejected all miracles, dismissed moral freedom, and taught the uselessness of prayer. That is to say, he confined the life of man to a world entirely controlled by natural law, and he denied all human access to the supernatural.

This presupposition already lay behind a movement destined to produce great social changes. From Pierre du Bois and Marsilio of Padua, onward through Machiavelli, Wycliffe, Bacon, and Hobbes, the position was developed, that the basic principle of society was something secular. Man's life in this world was to be controlled by considerations derived from this world and from his observation of it. And, I repeat, that assumption has energized throughout the modern period and has largely characterized it. It has been supposed that the deliverances of religious experience are something shadowy and doubtful, whereas the deliverances of science are sure and certain. Much has been made of the confusion and contradiction amongst theologians. Less has been heard of the confusion and contradiction amongst scientists. And the guidance of the State has

been placed in the hands of 'practical politicians,' so-called, who do not even claim to know what man is, or why he is here at all, or what he is supposed to be doing, but who do assert that they know how to make their nation more prosperous and their friends more wealthy.

Thus secularism has become the characterizing feature of 'modernity,' so far as that word has any meaning at all. And it is now being brought home to us that this thing really will not do. There is now a chance that men will begin again to understand that although our life in this world is intended to call forth the powers of personality in thought, feeling, and will, the exclusive concentration of those powers upon this world as their sole object will starve and stultify the human soul, reduce man's conception of his own dignity, and by the inescapable emphasis upon material gain as the criterion of success, will continue to produce confusion and disorder, war and strife. This is the pivotal point of the present situation, of which I want now to discuss certain features, and to ask in each instance, What is the Catholic solution and the Catholic hope?

1. We have to consider first that the true welfare of mankind depends to a very great extent upon what is the dominant conception of man. Until you have attained to some conclusions upon this question, you cannot discuss the future with any profit, because you have no notion as to what mankind ought to be doing

in the world. I suppose it is quite unfair to expect that science shall define man in any sort of supernatural relation. Biology will not do it. Not even psychology will do it. Science rightly and properly seeks to push the claims of natural law as far as possible, and when it deals with man, it must do its best to make him fit into this scheme of things. And so long as we all understand that man never will completely fit into this scheme, no harm is done.

But the supreme danger of the past generation, and one by no means entirely scotched, was that the human creature might come to be regarded simply as one of the subjects of science, to be totally accounted for by a set of formulae. The mind that weighed planets and measured their journeys might at length consider itself only as a fit subject for measurement. And since science inquires in order to control, it would then follow that the whole of man's life would fall under the control of experts in the science of man—the larger anthropology. Already we have our eugenists who would very much like to form themselves into a committee to arrange when and where a person shall be born, when and whom he shall marry, if he be allowed to marry at all, and finally, how long he shall be allowed to live: an expert committee on 'hatches, matches, and dispatches.'

But if man is to be defined in terms of this world, it follows that his business is entirely with this world; and his life must receive its

sanctions from this world. Thus, again, we have some kinds of socialism which would practically give to the secular State the entire ordering of the life of its citizens: a State, it must be remarked, to which criticism would be quite as intolerable as ever heresy was to the Church. Already, in Australia, they fine you if you do not vote at an election, though you may possibly take the view that the various parties soliciting your vote are equally ridiculous. This enormous importance attached to the secular State is a growth of the modern period. In older communities, as in the City States of Greece, the individual has been very much the possession of the society; but then the society was in some sort a religious fellowship. In the modern State this is not so. The modern State is an undefined relation of undefined creatures called men; and that is why those people who look entirely to the extension of the State's functions for the solution of our problems, are travelling into a blind alley.

For I will make bold to say that the secular view of man's future offers us a psychological impossibility. To expect that humanity can ultimately accept as its master any doctrine of science derived from the observation of this world, or any scheme or system based upon purely natural forces and considerations, is to exhibit a colossal ignorance of the human soul. For the mind of man will persist in asking those absolute and final questions, which science does

not attempt to answer—questions about God and the soul: Is there a heavenly Father? What will happen to me when I die? And the will of man cannot be content with ends which themselves are part of a passing, fleeting world. And the heart of man will not rest, unless it discover that the supreme creative and controlling force is love.

Unless the soul gain some certainty in these things, it must surely follow that life will seem unsatisfying, meaningless, worthless—a confused scramble under a dark sky. Science itself will be futile, unless we can somehow relate our knowledge to what is eternal. Upon all the triumphant and self-confident secularism of the modern period, there was bound to fall a mood of deep and deadly pessimism, unless men's minds could be fortified and enlightened from quarters they had too long neglected.

I think we can now see that what is needed is some definite conception, some sure confidence, about the meaning of this human existence. And that must mean some definite notion about our relations with the unseen, the supernatural, the transcendent. This is proved by the interest taken at the present time in what is known as 'spiritualism,' but is more properly called necromancy. For my own part, I can only say that after serious study I am quite unable to gather, from that testimony, one single clear idea as to my relation with the

other world, or as to what human life is all about. The Roman Church says that the spiritualists have simply got into contact with devils. I suppose that cannot readily be proved or disproved ; but at least I am sometimes inclined to think that they are in contact with disembodied lunatics. There is no guidance from that source, that sensible people can consider for a moment. And to put it quite plainly, what the world needs is definite religious dogma.

The scientist and the religious modernist will quickly bridle at this. But let me explain. As for the scientist, I would say that religious dogma does not mean dogma about the six days of creation, and Joshua's making the sun stand still. It means the expression of conclusions gained by religious experience ; and not merely the experience of this or that individual, but the experience of great numbers of men and women in many ages and countries. That is to say, we need the authority of the Church—not to contradict science, but to give light and leading in those realms which are far more important than any that science can control. Of course, if there were a general body of doctrine as to the existence and nature of God and our relation to Him, reached purely by observation of visible phenomena, it would have to be compared with the religious account. But there is no such body of doctrine offered by science. Science is incapable of giving

ultimate direction to our life, because it cannot claim to direct human motives.[1] It can deal only with those instruments which our motives employ. It can deal only with means, and not with ends. Man can use his science to play the devil. But what we need is some definite assertion—not even a philosophical speculation, but a definite assertion—a steady illumination upon the ends of conduct. And that means some dogma about God and the soul.

As for the modernist, I would say: It is all very well to be anxious that our creeds shall not contradict the truths revealed by science. The Church ought to be a truthful Church. But I would suggest that we really cannot effect a harmony between our creeds and the truths of science, until scientists have made up their minds as to what are the truths of science. Thirty years ago scientists were very certain that they had made up their minds. But the modernist in science is quite as doubtful about his creed as the modernist in religion is about his. And if religious certainty is always to wait upon scientific certainty, then again, we are still without guidance for our lives. We are still in the dark, looking for a light. But if religion is going to lead men, it must be able to point to a great light which has already shone and is still shining. If it possesses any

[1] Upon such limitations of science, see the Essays by Professor Aliotta and Professor Eddington, in *Science, Religion, and Reality*, edited by Joseph Needham, 1926.

certainty, it can say what that certainty is, and that will be dogma.

We shall all agree that the attempt to set forth religious conviction in terms of reason must fall short of expressing the whole reality. But that is not to admit the argument of some modernists, that the transcendent is totally incapable of being genuinely indicated in terms of reason. That position seems to me to open the way for agnosticism. Moreover, human personality is, after all, a unity ; and I cannot accept the assertion that the religious and ratiocinative powers of man are so utterly disparate as to be incapable of helpful and trustworthy relation. There was a time when Rationalists attacked the Church for being unreasonable and lacking veneration for Reason—with a capital R. The fashion has changed, and the Church is being assailed for having anything to do with reason. It looks, however, as if it is the Church which upholds a normal attitude, in face of fluctuating philosophical fads and fashions.

I fear you will be thinking that I am inflicting upon you a dull and verbose discourse. But I assure you there is a point in it, and to that point I now come. The world's future depends upon whether men will or will not believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is the visible presence of God, and the world's Saviour, so that progress can never be anything other than movement toward Him. It depends upon whether we

are going to accept or to reject His authority as absolutely determinative. We have somehow to bring back religion as the circumambient atmosphere of our activity: and as the normal foundation of our institutions. Religion —not as a vague aspiration, but as a definite teaching and a clear endeavour.

And while we Catholics must thankfully admit that thousands upon thousands of Protestants have staunchly and faithfully believed in our Lord as very God of very God and the only Redeemer of the world, we must nevertheless assert that it is in Catholicism that there abides the purpose and potency of applying this to the whole sphere of mundane existence. Within Protestantism there has always been a tendency to limit the extent of religion's control of life : even to admit the right of secular authority to control or patronize religion. This was the development in Germany and to some degree in England. Some English Dissenters proclaimed a splendid testimony against this in the early days ; but our modern Nonconformists, I fear, gave away their principle when they allowed the State to pay the salaries of Nonconformist ministers for preaching to Nonconformist soldiers during the Great War.

A minister dressed in khaki and paid by the Government is obviously not expected to say anything very critical about the Government. And if for ' the Government ' in the narrower sense we substitute all those economic and

social interests which are concerned to keep things as they are—then I suppose Nonconformity is really as much 'established' to-day as is the Church of England.

At any rate, Protestantism was not, in its genesis and genius, disposed to claim that the Church must lead the whole world. It made no such stupendous claim as Catholicism always makes. And that is why the Protestant Churches have less and less presented the world with the appearance and witness of a heaven-born, supernatural reality—as seen in their public worship, their architecture, and their general method of approach to religion. In spite of the great services they have rendered to religious and moral life, they do not look like supernatural truth taking hold of human society and moulding all its expression. (Of course, I speak of denominations and not of individuals.) The Protestant Churches have never claimed for themselves that they are the Church of Humanity. There are too many of them to allow such a claim to become intelligible. But they do not even claim to reorganize the whole corporate life of the men who belong to them. Catholicism has made this claim.

Calvin's experiment at Geneva did not become representative of the main Protestant advance. The Protestant countries have gloried in pointing to that very 'progress' which now seems a sort of illusion because it never had any clear religious sanctions. It is perfectly true

that Catholic Christianity needs every genuine religious element which Protestantism has preserved; but over and above these, the world most patently needs one authoritative tradition of Christian truth and culture: the conception of a human race becoming a church—a divine society: the acceptance of the dominance of religion as the real shaper of politics and economics, the real user of science. To this, the mediaeval Church was feeling its way, and it lost its way. But the world will wander in confusion until its feet are once more upon the high road of a Christocracy.

This will be yet more apparent when we pass on to consider two enormous problems which embarrass our modern situation, and are two of its chief aspects.

2. In thinking of the world's future, there must always be present to our minds a certain danger, that in some mood of panic or pride the human race may decivilize or even destroy itself. It is a disturbing reflection, that if we are going to speak of progress in terms of mechanical contrivance, then one of the chief features of our modern progress is the enormous efficiency we have achieved in our power to kill one another.

I have recently been reading Mr. Chesterton's book, *The Everlasting Man*, in some respects a very fine book. But I observe that the gifted author is still obsessed by the notion that fighting is one of the noblest employments of man, and a very proper expression of the

Christian spirit. But then Mr. Chesterton's idea of fighting seems to be nothing more alarming than a school-fight, or at most a tournament. He is fond of drums and trumpets, swords and flags. I suppose it is all due to his generous love of courage and romance. We have regretfully to tell Mr. Chesterton that drums and trumpets, swords and flags, have no place in modern warfare. The chemist and the engineer, gas, petrol, and electricity—these will be the protagonists and arms. And the effect will be, not the gallant charges and heroic deaths of soldiers, but the wholesale destruction of men, women, and children in crowded cities.

War is not going to be a romantic spectacle any more. And I imagine that in the next war it will require more courage to lie in bed in Jesmond or Kensington than to stand in the trenches anywhere. War, in fact, is going to be a deadly problem for the human race. And the interlocking of the world's political and economic interests is going to make it increasingly difficult to confine any conflict to two or three nations.

Now, I happen to believe that it is impossible to defend the Christian Faith by armed force. But whatever we may think about the question of force, I suppose we shall all agree that peace is highly desirable, and that wholesale disarmament would be a good thing for all nations. And when we look at the possibilities of armed conflict in the world, we see at once that the

root of the evil, in the present time, is the existence of secular States which call themselves sovereign States, possess no sure ground of common fellowship, and admit no superior authority. Modern war is war between nations. There is a good deal of rivalry between Lancashire and Yorkshire, but no possibility of a war between them. There is little possibility of a religious war — between Catholics and Protestants, or between Christians and Mohammedans, as such. With few and comparatively small exceptions, the modern secular State has established itself as the only armed community. It alone possesses armaments upon any considerable scale. Therefore, if there is to be a reign of peace, the isolation and the so-called sovereignty of nations must in some way be modified.

As we all know, an attempt to do this has been made in the League of Nations. I do not wish to say a single word in criticism of the League, excepting only that it is not a League of Nations, and, apart from its name, does not even pretend to be a League of Nations. It is a league of governments. It is not a fellowship of peoples. It is not, and never will be, the home and brotherhood of men, in which Germans and Russians, British, French, and Americans, may realize a tradition, a culture, a society, above and beyond that of their nation. Such a cultural fellowship must have deeper roots. Indeed, I believe it can be provided only by a common religion.

We have seen the great need for a Catholic Church as teacher. We now see the equal need for the Catholic Church as the universal fellowship. And not merely for the negative purpose of avoiding war, but for the positive purpose of constructing peace, by bringing all the varied gifts and graces of the earth's peoples into a common pool, under a single sanction, whereby all may be enriched and enlarged. Only a supernatural motive can give us the positive unification of the human endeavour. Only a Church can express that supernatural motive. But while the Church is divided, and Christian men are split into sects and denominations, the looked-for brotherhood of man must wait. We believe that the Christian revelation is destined to provide the only permanent cohesive principle amongst men. But while Christians fail to realize this amongst themselves, the world will walk in confusion.

The reunion of Christendom is the great Christian cause of to-day and to-morrow. I believe that the Lambeth Appeal will stand out in history as a landmark, and we ought to be humbly grateful that such a landmark was set up by the Church of England. I know how tremendous are the problems to be solved; but I am more than ever convinced that the chief problems are quite capable of solution. I believe that the Evangelical and the Catholic testimonies are not contradictory, but that the latter ought to contain and complete the former. And

I believe that the doctrines of Episcopacy and Episcopal Orders have no essential conflict with the idea of the Church as a spiritual democracy —or rather, a Christocracy. Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, our successors will make great advances toward reunion, and when that is accomplished, the Church will be able to do for the world what she has had no chance of doing for nearly five hundred years. Not only will she have the opportunity of pacifying the feuds of Christendom, but she will be enabled to face the task of Foreign Missions with tenfold success.

And let us not forget that one of the factors in the world's future welfare is the speed and completeness with which the Faith can be given to the non-Christian peoples. Can we, for example, make China Christian, before the ideals of industrialism and militarism have entirely conquered her ancient quiet? Is it not a lamentable and pathetic reflection, that we are taking a broken and bewildered Christianity to the non-Christian lands? We need a Church into which all the nations may come as to their own home and abiding place—not losing their distinctive gifts, but sharing in brotherhood with all others.

I think that Anglo-Catholics can claim to have as clear a perception of these needs as is possessed by any other group of Christians. In my own experience, there is more of such noble dreaming in Anglo-Catholicism than any-

where else. Naturally, we believe in reunion upon certain principles, and not as a mere amalgamation due to formless and unthinking sentimentalism. We naturally look at least as much to Rome and the East, as we do to English Nonconformity. We stand for the recognition of historic continuity, for the elements of Catholic practice, and for the necessity of dogmatic certainty in the great Christian fundamentals. But you will find Anglo-Catholics often offering a large and sympathetic interpretation of these things, and showing a real desire for fellowship with all those who love our Lord.

3. The other important feature of the present situation, of which I must speak, is that of economic relations. It is now many years since Benjamin Kidd pointed out that the old vertical divisions — the national divisions — between men, were being complicated by what he called horizontal divisions, so that in all industrial countries there was arising a common strife between Capital and Labour. There is no time, nor is this the occasion, to discuss the history of this conflict in its barest outlines. We know that it is part of our life to-day, and that it does not tend to diminish. There are some who suppose that the trouble would vanish if the workers would work harder and produce more—as though we had never heard of unemployment and slack trade due to the overstocking of the world's markets! There

are others who fondly hope that the invention of cheaper and more rapid production will make greater wealth available for the masses—as though we had not read John Stuart Mill's verdict about machinery as a panacea! Of course we know that the problem in its roots is a moral and spiritual one, and concerns not chiefly the method, but the motive, of production and distribution.

Now, this economic problem has got to be settled; but it will not be settled by any scheme or programme, apart from a change of atmosphere and difference of approach. I mean, a difference in mankind's essential approach to the material world. And here the Catholic Faith has the truly saving word. I suppose most men who call themselves Christians will agree that our Lord always implied that material things were to be used for spiritual ends. But the Catholic Faith connects this teaching with the Incarnation itself, and declares that an Incarnation of God was possible only because of the potentially sacramental significance of material things.

The critics of sacramental religion, when they talk of superstition, often miss the point. The Catholic Faith does not say that any man, who happens to know the right formula, can turn anything into the Body of Christ by reciting a spell over it. What it does say is that the Church—that is, a moral and spiritual corporation—turns common bread into our Lord's

Body, when its duly appointed representative speaks the intelligible words which, upon an occasion of definite intention, express the essential meaning of Christ and His fellowship. In other words, the accomplishment of the Sacrament is achieved upon a moral and spiritual basis, and has a moral and spiritual meaning. It means that we devote this bread and this wine to the supreme purpose of Christ, and we believe that therein we find Him more comprehensively than elsewhere.

And that belief must dictate our attitude to all material things—not that we can yet accept the whole world as the sacramental Body of our Lord, because the human approach to the whole world is yet commingled with so much of selfishness and sin. But we can assure ourselves that it is only in the sacramental approach to all the material means of life, seeking to find in and through them a divine-human communion, that we shall ever begin to solve the economic problem of our day. Certainly it seems to me that the growing power and influence of sacramental religion is divinely guided ; for it is most significant that this development should be taking place in a period when the world is most distracted and embarrassed by the problems of material production and distribution, and by the whole question of the ethics of material gain and possession.

That question is not going to be answered by any science, either physical or economic,

because its genesis is in the creative spirit of man. I can conceive a world of vastly developed scientific knowledge and mechanical contrivance, even more deeply disturbed by economic injustice. The question is, What motive shall control the human approach to the material environment? If recent metaphysical conclusions are in any way right, and man and the universe are interdependent, then it would seem that the indwelling, by Christ, of the soul and society must be completed by the embodiment of Christ in daily bread. That is not yet accomplished. Its accomplishment will be the kingdom of God. Nor is it entirely unaccomplished; because our Lord in His mercy left to His own people a sign, and a real instance, of its accomplishment, in the Eucharist. To call the Eucharist materialistic or magical is sheer nonsense, and sometimes it is dishonest nonsense. The Eucharist is the profound answer to the heart of man in the twentieth century, as it will be in the fortieth century, if this present order endure so long.

For the heart of man remains, in spite of all changes. That little poem of James Elroy Flecker, *To a poet, a thousand years hence*, expresses this truth very beautifully—that man is always man :

> I who am dead a thousand years,
> And wrote this sweet archaic song,
> Send you my words for messengers
> The way I shall not pass along.

I care not if you bridge the seas,
Or ride secure the cruel sky,
Or build consummate palaces
Of metal or of masonry.

But have you wine and music still,
And statues and a bright-eyed love,
And foolish thoughts of good and ill,
And prayers to them who sit above?

How shall we conquer? like a wind
That falls at eve our fancies blow,
And old Maeonides the blind
Said it three thousand years ago.

O friend unseen, unborn, unknown,
Student of our sweet English tongue,
Read out my words at night, alone:
I was a poet, I was young.

Since I can never see your face,
And never shake you by the hand,
I send my soul through time and space
To greet you. You will understand.[1]

Because the human heart abides, and the heart craves for love, the message of the love of God and the love of man will abide through all time; and only as men realize that love in the Catholic Church of Christ, the Church of the Gospel and the Sacrament, the one Society of God's redeeming endeavour, will they be able to build their society upon enduring foundations. Within that sacramental society we are veritably conjoined with our fellows, lesser

[1] Flecker's poem is published by Martin Secker, and appears also in Sir Algernon Methuen's *Anthology of Modern Verse*.

loyalties transmuted and barriers overcome. Distance is demolished and time is conquered. Finding the central, revealing mystery in common bread, we pray and labour for the coming of that city, whereof the very light is the Presence of God and of the Lamb, and all the activity of its citizens is praise and thanksgiving.

We have seen a time in which men have attempted upon a wide field a secular solution of the problem of their existence in this world. I think it not a rash thing to assume that this attempt is demonstrably failing, and that the period which we call 'modern' is drawing to its decline. Within that period there have been many attempts to compromise between religion and the secular solution. No one can deny that of all the presentations of the Christian Faith, it is Catholicism which has most staunchly withstood such attempts. A hundred years ago, Catholicism was the least fashionable of all religious opinions in this country. To-day, it is the most living and hopeful. And I am disposed to think that this is due, not to any advances which Rome may or may not have made, but to the growth of English Catholicism in the English Church.

This is not a service to Rome. It is a service to the Catholic Church and the Catholic Age. And in that age, the Roman part of the Church will probably be as different from modern Romanism as modern Romanism is from mediaeval Catholicism. The Catholics of the

English Church must make their contribution toward the revival of a Catholic Christendom. Let them have nothing to do with obscurantism in philosophy; let them be ready to welcome all clear truth. Let them have no alliances with the forces of unfair privilege and reaction in social and economic movements; let them seek the Christian fellowship. But let them proclaim the Christian Faith, the Christian Church, the Christian Sacraments. Let them practise the Catholic discipline. Let them set forth the beauty of God in worship and life. And they will do a mighty work in the world.

We are sometimes rather annoyed, nowadays, because people will still persist in calling us High Churchmen. That description, seeming to connote coolness, stiffness, remoteness from popular life, seems really the very opposite of all that the Anglo-Catholic movement is aiming at. We call ourselves simply Catholics. Some of us do not look very 'High Church.' For the most part, moreover, we are not the finicking ritualists our critics make us out to be. We think that a ritual order in worship is as natural as a ritual order in conducting a public meeting; only we insist that the Church's worship is not a public meeting, and demands a loftier and lovelier ritual. But nowadays we are not inclined to exaggerate the importance of points of detail. We are concerned to save the souls of men and the society of man. We are concerned to gather England, broken by greed and pride,

scarred by poverty and sorrow, into a living fellowship around the brotherly altars of our Lord. We are concerned for Righteousness and Joy to take the place of selfishness and gloom.

And yet, after all, the old name of 'High Church' has its own beauty, because a High Church may be like a High Road. And we desire to point men to a certain highway, whereon the lame man shall leap as an hart, over which the unclean shall not pass, and wherein wayfaring men, though fools, even as we are fools, shall not err.

Printed by A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd.
London and Oxford

NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

DATE DUE

JAN 5 '87

Printed in USA

80480 280.31S P337
Peck, W.G.
Catholicism and humanity
11 NOV 1928 15 NOV 1928
1/9/28 10 JAN 1928
25 APR 1936 APR 1936
280.31S P337 80480
JAN 1928

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
00055464